

UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

MAY 1 1953

Anglican Theological Review

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

Q Sapientia facititer quodlibet
per desponsus omnia : veni ad
doctrinam nos vitam prudentie



EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXXV

APRIL 1953

NUMBER 2

BL

CONTENTS

The Roomiest Church	<i>Louis Bowes Keiter</i>	81
The Sacramental System of the Body of Christ	<i>W. Norman Pittenger</i>	89
Propositions in Solid Theology	<i>Walter Lowrie</i>	98
The Proposed Revision of Our Liturgy ..	<i>Cyril C. Richardson</i>	106
Miracle and Natural Law in the Age of the Fathers	<i>Noah E. Fehl</i>	117
Old Testament Studies Today	<i>Walter C. Klein</i>	121
Book Reviews		132
Notes on New Books		141

PUBLISHED BY

THE ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

UNIVERSITY PRESS
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE

\$1.00 A NUMBER

\$3.50 A YEAR

Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXXV

APRIL 1953

NUMBER 2

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, Th.D., D.D., D.S.Litt., D.C.L., S.T.D.,
Director of Graduate Studies, Union Theological Seminary

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. HOLT HUTTON GRAHAM, M.A., S.T.M.,
Assistant Professor of New Testament, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D.,
Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

—:—

EDITORIAL BOARD

REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D.
RT. REV. STEPHEN F. BAYNE, JR., S.T.D.
REV. FRANCIS WRIGHT BEARE, Ph.D.
REV. J. V. LANGMEAD CASSERLEY, D.Litt.
PRES. GORDON KEITH CHALMERS, Ph.D.
RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D.
RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D.
RT. REV. RICHARD S. M. EMRICH, Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES R. FEILDING, M.A.
REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D.
REV. ROBERT MCQUEEN GRANT, Th.D.
RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D.
PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D.
REV. EDWARD R. HARDY, JR., Ph.D.
REV. LOUIS A. HASELMAYER, JR., Ph.D.
REV. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, Ph.D.
REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D.
REV. E. FELIX KLOMAN, D.D., S.T.D.
REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, JR., Ph.D.
PROF. JOHN S. MARSHALL, Ph.D.
REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D.
REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D.

REV. ARNOLD S. NASH, D.D.
RT. REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D.
REV. WILLIAM H. NES, D.D., D.C.L.
REV. PIERSON PARKER, Th.D.
REV. JAMES A. PIKE, J.S.D.
REV. W. NORMAN PITTINGER, S.T.D.
REV. CYRIL C. RICHARDSON, Th.D.
REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D.
REV. OSCAR J. F. SEITZ, Th.D.
REV. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR., Ph.D.
RT. REV. HENRY KNOX SHERRILL, D.D.
RT. REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D.
REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D.
REV. CHARLES W. F. SMITH, D.D.
RT. REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D.
REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, JR., Th.D.
PROF. GEORGE F. THOMAS, Ph.D.
REV. JESSE McL. TROTTER
REV. PERCY L. URBAN, S.T.D.
PROF. JOACHIM WACH, Ph.D.
REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D.
REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D.
REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D.

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut
THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC, Berkeley, California
EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts
GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City

KENYON COLLEGE, Gambier, Ohio
NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin
TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario
UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, Sewanee, Tennessee
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia
SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois

—:—

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: January, April, July, October. Subscription price \$3.50 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. Holt H. Graham, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Sewanee, Tennessee.

Anglican Theological Review

Founded in 1918 by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

EDITED SINCE 1924 BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT

VOLUME XXXV

APRIL 1953

NUMBER 2

THE ROOMIEST CHURCH

By LOUIS BOWES KEITER

All Saints' Episcopal Church

Portland, Oregon

We Episcopalians like to make the claim that our Anglican Communion is "the roomiest Church in Christendom." The principle is called comprehensiveness. We glory in it; yet it must be confessed that our very roominess sometimes worries us also. Lord Chatham is quoted as having declared that the Church of England had "an Arminian clergy, a Calvinistic creed, and a Catholic liturgy." More recently *Time* magazine quoted an unidentified person as having said that the Episcopal Church has a Catholic clergy and a Protestant laity. While we squirm under these half truths, there is enough reality in them to put our roominess beyond the understanding of outsiders. And sometimes it puzzles even ourselves.

Our roomy Church includes within one household of faith both the Catholic-minded and the Protestant-minded. It is patient of both Catholic doctrine and Protestant doctrine, Catholic piety and Protestant piety, Catholic theories of polity and Protestant theories of polity. During the past century this same freedom has caused the once stoutly conservative Anglican Communion to comprehend also

within its wide boundaries some rather extreme forms of liberalism. This is noticeable in theological disciplines and in economic and social theory. The rise of a variety of "liberalisms" has utterly confused party lines within the Church, but the confusion has not decreased the traditional tensions. Alarmed outside observers are indeed frequently prepared for the complete disintegration of the Church at any time. This is particularly true when our own Episcopal Church gathers its tensions together into a General Convention.

That the threatened explosions do not occur and that General Conventions are for the most part singularly lacking in excitement is a noteworthy fact. It is perhaps due to the equally singular fact that Catholic-Protestant, conservative-liberal tensions exist not only as between groups within the Church. They are present also in the worship, piety, and thinking of thousands of devoted individuals, both clerical and lay. Numbers of these individuals have for so long breathed the free air of Anglicanism that they can see truth on both sides of many a seemingly irreconcilable conflict.

We glory in that breadth of vision but it does have limits. The occasional and not always voluntary departure of priest or layman from our midst to some more definite or more liberal discipline is witness enough that our comprehensiveness is not all-inclusive. Some few others are forever trying its patience, as if to defy the Church to take a stand. That deep searchings of heart are caused and sometimes lasting spiritual harm done to others by these antics is probably no part of their intent. But where do the limits lie?

To find them it is perhaps best to appeal to history, and to turn once more to our often renewed study of the English Reformation which set the course of this roomy Church. Even if it be granted, which it is not, that the Reformation in England began in the reign of Henry VIII, we shall find little roominess there. Henry beheaded the papist for treason and burned the Protestant for heresy with a fine impartiality which speaks more for his political acumen than for his Christianity. Under Edward VI the roominess gained was largely political in character. The Protestant movement in England was still numerically very small. It was comprised chiefly of intellectuals who had been influenced by Lutheranism or by the Reformers of Switzerland, or both. Their principal popular support lay in a significant proportion of the population of London. Economic factors and a possible survival of Lollardy were probably as important there as

Continental teachings. The surprising strength of so small a group must be attributed to political leaders striving for a north European Protestant League. Both the first and second Prayer Books and the Forty-two Articles issued in 1553, seven weeks before the death of Edward VI, are comprehensive in tone. There can be little doubt that they were made so largely for expediency's sake. National unity was at stake. The machinery of state was in the hands of the Reforming party. The officers of the Church were chiefly men of the Old Learning. Both sides therefore temporized, each in the anticipation of eventual thorough triumph.

After the hiatus of Mary's reign came the Elizabethan Settlement. As the exiles returned from the Continent, one thing was immediately apparent. Protestantism had come to England to stay and, for the first time, fed by the fires of persecution, it had wide popular support. As another legacy of Mary's five bitter years there were also numbers of convinced Romanists, both moderate and extreme. A great part of the people and of their leaders cried "a plague on both your houses" and earnestly sought what was the Queen's desire, a Church in which all Englishmen could be at home. It was in this hope, surely a forerunner of the prayers of modern advocates of ecumenicity, that Anglican comprehensiveness was born. As we shall see, the fullness of the vision had only twelve years to live, but it has left its indelible stamp upon the Church of England and her daughter Churches overseas.

The Elizabethan Prayer Book is first to be noted in this connection. It was not a strikingly new book. There were only three major changes from that of 1552, but all of these were in the comprehensive direction. The services were substantially translations of the Latin rite with such modifications as were required to eliminate the more superstitious forms of medieval piety. They also included additions and changes from the pens of Protestant devotional experimenters. The book was patient of a considerable variety of doctrinal interpretations and so might be used by men of widely separated opinions without offense to tender consciences. All of this was done deliberately, carefully, and with the intention of charity.

When the work was done, the new Prayer Book was imposed by an Act of Uniformity. However wise or unwise this procedure may have been, it remains true in every province of the Anglican Communion, that priest or bishop who attempts on his own initiative to

revise the Book of Common Prayer or habitually to use services not contained in it does so in direct violation of the Canon Law—in England of the civil law also. In this particular we have advanced beyond the Elizabethan Settlement in only one way. He who cannot conscientiously use the Book of Common Prayer may now freely depart from the Church and worship according to his lights. That has been achieved only at the sacrifice of the fundamental Elizabethan concept of one Church for all of the people.

The Act of Uniformity applied to the rite, that is to the form of words contained in the Book of Common Prayer. The Ornaments Rubric probably was intended to achieve a similar uniformity of ceremony. The vast majority in England used the Prayer Book, but because of Puritan resistance the Ornaments Rubric was never enforceable in law or practice. Parker's Advertisements in 1566 are simply a concession to this fact. They were an attempt, quite outside the regular machinery of ecclesiastical law, to secure a minimum of ceremonial observance, since the standards of the Ornaments Rubric were unattainable. The forlorn request for rather more ceremonial adornment than the surplice alone, at least in the larger churches, is indicative of this fact. It must be remembered that even the use of the surplice was sturdily resisted by some Puritans. A fairly long-lived compromise was eventually achieved on a rather barren level until the revival of vestiarian controversies in the nineteenth century. The present-day situation of notable variance in the use or non-use of chasubles, copes, lights, incense and images, with markedly little necessary doctrinal connotation, is probably more genuinely Anglican than either side would wish to concede.

All men may and most will argue about the externals of religion. The sixteenth century turned more readily than our own to doctrinal exactitude in the composition of "confessions" of faith. The Church of England made its most notable contribution to this literature in the XXXIX Articles of 1563. The new Articles were based on the Forty-two Articles of 1553, which in turn had been indirectly influenced by the Confession of Augsburg through Cranmer's unofficial Thirteen Articles of 1538. The Thirteen Articles were issued after a Conference between Cranmer and certain Lutheran divines and were intended to implement a political alliance between England and the Protestant princes of Germany. The Forty-two Articles based on them were not a complete outline of doctrine but a controversial two-edged

sword aimed on the one hand at medieval abuses and on the other at Anabaptist errors. The revision of 1563 was made by Archbishop Parker and Bishop Guest of Rochester. The XXXIX Articles attempted a more systematic and less controversial exposition of doctrine than their English predecessors. A second Lutheran source, the Confession of Württemberg, was heavily drawn upon. Thus two Lutheran documents may be listed as sources of the XXXIX Articles. It would be noted however by any Lutheran theologian that the Articles studiously avoid Luther's enthusiasm for the word "alone".

The independence of the Church of England as against Rome is strongly stated. It is to be noted that Elizabeth desired to retain the Romanists in her Church. The medieval abuses protested are not the closely reasoned new Romanism of the Council of Trent. Few of the Tridentine decrees had yet been issued, and of these only one, that which seems to equate the authority of Scripture and tradition, is directly answered. An instance of Elizabeth's tenderness toward the Romanists is her suppression on her own authority (until after 1570) of Article XXIX.

The Articles are frequently called Calvinistic. If tone and language and the verbal formulation of doctrines universally accepted are to be the criterion, the dependence upon Calvin, who was after all the great theologian of the age, must be acknowledged. In the peculiarly Calvinistic doctrines, however, the Articles are "notably defective", as the advanced Puritans continued to protest for a hundred years until their eventual withdrawal into non-conformity.

The XXXIX Articles are thus based on the centuries-long tradition of Catholic theology, with borrowings and correction in the great controversies of the age from both Lutheran and Calvinist sources. It was hoped that moderate Romanist and reasonable Protestant might find in the Church for which these Articles were an outline of faith a spiritual home and a common meeting ground. It has been argued that the attempt was largely political in motivation. Even if that be true, the result was not political and the Church was shortly to produce her own theologians, reasoned, charitable, and wholly Anglican, in the persons of Hooker and the Caroline divines.

The continuation of this tradition in Anglican theology has had important results in modern doctrinal perplexities. No branch of Christendom has more thoroughly integrated the past century's vast

increase in scientific knowledge with its own religious opinion. Our intellectual comprehensiveness has enabled Anglican theologians to look fearlessly at new light on the truth and to avoid for the most part both the rigidity of the so-called fundamentalists and the sterility of those modernists who are so casually ready to agree that the slightest breath of new knowledge can blow away entirely the wisdom of the ages. We are intellectually free and reassuringly aware that the truth has many facets.

The Anglican tradition of comprehensiveness was evolved more or less consciously in the effort to achieve a truly national Church for the English people. Perhaps its most surprising extension has been in the field of culture. As the Church of England has mothered the world-wide Anglican Communion she has met many "alien" cultures. Her missionaries have not gone forth with a Bible in one hand and a mother hubbard in the other. Taught by her own experience to differentiate between the good news of Jesus Christ and things indifferent our church has been enabled to lay the varied gifts of many cultures at the feet of the Master. In this field Anglicanism has an enormous advantage over the descendants of those who allowed themselves to be led into schism by such matters as rigid insistence on one form of sabbath observance. Strong national churches, each indigenous to its own culture and producing its own native ministry, but all loyally Anglican, are sufficient witness to the success and importance of this element in true comprehensiveness.

Yet it must be conceded that these and other values of our freedom are the present day results of a dream that failed. Elizabeth and her ecclesiastical statesmen conceived of a church as inclusive as the nation itself. Perhaps such a dream deserved to fail. If conformity could be achieved only by force, it was not worth the having. If comprehension implied such a feeble grasp upon the truth that any man's heresy was truth enough, the formless mass could not be dignified by the name of Church. In any event the limitations were shortly apparent.

For nearly a generation there had been two groups of Romanists in England. The first and largest included those who, though their ties to the ancient faith and to the spiritual primacy of Rome were great, recognized many of the English reforms as just and of national right. These, where ultra-Protestant zeal permitted, were conformable to the established Church. The year 1570 saw the papal hier-

archy give complete victory to the second party, later called ultramontanist. This group accepted the developed papal theory as *de fide* and regarded the national church as heretical and schismatic. The papal decision, even with its implications of treason, brought many moderate Romanists into this group. For our purposes the important point is that since 1570 there have been in England Christian men eloquently willing to die for their faith who were and are completely outside the Church of England. We arrive at a limitation of Anglican comprehensiveness. Whatever the providence of God may later reveal, developed Romanism and Anglicanism are today incompatible and have been so for nearly four centuries.

It is nearly a century later when we reach another road block. The decision was long overdue, postponed only by decades of civil strife in which political, social economic, and dynastic elements were severally of equal weight with religious considerations. The religious issue is really very simple. In the opinion of many the Church of England has never been reformed "along the lines of the best Reformed Churches." She is not Calvinist in doctrine. She is not Puritan in discipline. She is not "free" or "pure" in liturgy and worship. She is hardly Protestant in polity. Yet in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries many of her greatest sons were concerned that she should be all of these things. They were defeated. The events surrounding the Restoration and the publication of the Prayer Book of 1662 symbolized their defeat. No alternative remained for the ultra-Protestant but to depart from the House of Baal. Protestant Non-Conformity as a mass movement may be said to date from 1662. With it the failure of Elizabeth's dream draws near completion. Here is another and larger group of Christian Englishmen wholly outside the Church of England. One hundred and seventy years before Keble's Assize Sermon it should have been "obvious to all men diligently studying" that Anglicanism and root-and-branch Protestantism are mutually incompatible.

The Church suffered. The leaders on both sides of the great controversy had departed from her. With notable exceptions they left the fatigued, the complacent, and the indifferent to direct her life. The survival, spread, and enrichment of Anglicanism in the past two and one half centuries is a miracle that could not have been predicted on a this-worldly view of the premises. The sorriest part of the story is the attempt of the state and some leaders of the Church to compel

uniformity by political sanctions. Though the last of the Test Acts and their like were not expunged from English statute books until after World War I, this attempt met the failure it deserved long before that date.

Indeed it is rather in the world-wide spread of the Anglican Communion than in the Church of England on her home soil alone that we can see her glory to the full. When the heat of bitter passions had cooled it became apparent that there remained an Anglican spirit, vitality, and theology, beat out hot upon the anvil of Christian experience, able to commend itself to the Christian consciousness of an ever widening multitude and by its very origin capable of understanding other Christians so long and so bitterly separated that they are no longer able to communicate directly with one another.

Anglicanism alone of the separated Christendoms has undeviatingly maintained the most catholic view of the unity of the Church. Where else will we find the uncompromising assertion that the "Church is the Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head, and all baptised people are members?" When a baptized Christian of some other communion declares that he wants "to join the Episcopal Church," every priest knows the slight but rather glorious semantic difficulty of explaining to him how this end is to be accomplished. We have, in fact, no separated sacraments or rites, no exclusively Anglican doctrines. The Anglican tradition is both the fruit and the heritage of historic world Christianity.

The modern ecumenical movement has from its inception found distinguished Anglicans in its leadership. Some of our own present-day tensions spring from that fact. We yearn, perhaps more deeply than others, for the visible unity of the Church. Some would hasten the process by sacrificial accommodation to European or American Protestantism. Others, impatient of this limited view of reunion, look perhaps too yearningly over the mountains to the "great Latin Church of the West." Until our Lord's high priestly prayer "that they all may be one" is accomplished both of these tensions are perhaps inevitable. The triumph of either of them would destroy the Anglican heritage. More important, it would set back indefinitely the last best hope for Christian unity.

The true Anglican will live, according to his lights, in the most rigorous loyalty to our own heritage. He will rejoice greatly that within our own wide boundaries we already have much in little, that

in thousands of our parishes Christians of the most diverse backgrounds have found at last a spiritual home, and that in these same parishes other men in increasing numbers are finding for the first time the blessings of Christ.

We are indeed righteously impatient and perhaps need to be reminded of the New Testament teaching that this life is a waiting time, a time of expectation. While we wait it is to be expected that old heresies and new will be enunciated, detected, and quarreled over, that strange designs and wild hopes will have their brief times of prominence. Meanwhile our most devout prayer must be that the true and quiet life of the Church will be ever more fruitful and that the roomy Anglican Communion will continue to demonstrate to all men her historic contention that it is possible for brethren to dwell together in unity.

THE SACRAMENTAL SYSTEM OF THE BODY OF CHRIST

By W. NORMAN PITTENGER

General Theological Seminary

The term sacrament can be used in a general or in a narrow sense. In the latter, it may be defined in a famous sentence of Hugh of St. Victor as "a corporeal or material element offered to the senses, which from likeness represents, from institution signifies, and from consecration contains, some invisible and spiritual grace." If we employ this definition, we shall see that four points are included—the sign, the grace, the effectual operation, and the dominical institution in some proper sense. Such a four-point definition, likewise, will control for us the number of the sacraments which are, so to say, ecclesiastical and thereby specifically Christian. If we are concerned with the broader sense of the term sacrament, however, we shall find that the definition of St. Augustine is eminently satisfactory: *signum sacrum*, or *signum rei sacrae*. Alternatively, the definition offered in the Catechism of the Book of Common Prayer, if we come to a stop with the opening phrases, will serve: "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." So soon as we continue with the Prayer Book's definition, however, we find

ourselves in the realm of the specific and ecclesiastical sacrament. Much confusion has arisen in this connection; and I suggest that it is essential both to sound theology and to clear thinking—the two are necessarily one, I should say—that we maintain our distinctions.

Our first concern, then, is with sacrament in its broader meaning, in its natural sense, in its universal import. And I should wish to lay it down as a primary condition for any satisfactory study of the whole matter of sacraments that the particular sacraments of the Christian Church, “the sacramental system of the Body of Christ,” are from one point of view (and that a profoundly important one) simply special instances or particular illustrations of a general sacramental principle which is natural to the whole created order. Grace, we are told by St. Thomas Aquinas, perfects nature; it does not destroy the naturally good creation of God but brings that creation to its intended goal and its proper fruition. Likewise, the special sacraments of the Church are not contradictory to or a denial of the natural order itself; on the contrary, they crown and complete that order by its full and intentional infusion by, informing with, divine grace in a particularly and peculiarly intensive and distinctive fashion.

Man himself is a sacramental being. Francis Thompson has expressed this idea poetically.

In this narrow bed,
Spirit and sense are wed,

says he of human personality. Edmund Spenser has raised for us the question whether body helps soul more than soul helps body. It is a fact of common experience that our material or corporeal system is the expressive medium for our *selves*. Our bodies are the vehicle by which we act, in which we dwell, through which we “get ourselves across.” No body—no man. A spiritualism which would deny man’s genuine “body-ness” is nonsense; it denies the truths of his existence which are most directly familiar to him. Even in thought itself—the act which, as Aquinas tells us, is proper to man as rational being, and so distinguishes him from *mere* animals—the process, which doubtless is mental and spiritual, is carried on with a genuine dependence upon convolutions of some millions of grey-cells in the brain. Man is no angel, despite some of our modern idealists; neither is he mere animal, as contemporary “naturalists”

(in the cheaper use of that word) would suggest. He is mind-body, body-mind, amphibian in his constitution.

Secondly, the entire world of our experience is sacramental. That is to say, in it values, ideals, purposes, spiritual realities are expressed and operative only in, through and under material or corporeal realities. No one has ever seen Goodness; we have only seen good actions, good deeds, goodness bodied forth to us through the visibly real. No one has ever seen Beauty; we have only known beautiful landscapes, beautiful objects or forms, beautiful faces or phrases. No one has ever seen or known Truth; we have acquaintance only with true propositions or statements. No one has ever known Love, in its unmediated essence; we have but glimpsed it incarnate in persons or works. So it is with all the other values or (as we say) spiritual realities. They are sacramentally known to us, and known to us in no other fashion. And when we find God, it is most securely and certainly in this manner. St. Thomas says, "through signs that can be perceived by the senses the mind is stimulated in its aim towards God;" and it is part of the wisdom of the Catholic Church that it has tended to be suspicious of, though never to deny, religious experience and mysticism unless these are regulated and controlled by the sheer commonsense of the ordinary man's mode of perception and way of reaching Divine Reality.

The phrase from St. Thomas which has just been quoted leads us to a third general truth which is frequently neglected. Baron von Hügel once remarked that he kissed his child, not only *because* he loved it, but also in order that he might love it *more*. In other words, the experience of men goes to show that physical contacts, material realities, things done in the realm of the corporeal, tangible, visible, sensible, are the most effective way in which states of mind, attitudes, beliefs, certainties of many sorts may be stimulated, may even be inaugurated, not to say deepened and enriched. In marriage, for example, the physical relationship of sexual intercourse does not merely express a spiritual love between man and wife; the physical act deepens and makes more real that love. So we might run through the range of human activities and of human experience of the physical world—one's knowledge of values such as goodness and beauty, for example, is stimulated into being by objects and actions; and in religion, the material world both speaks for and conveys effectively the presence and the action of God.

Finally, when Divine Being wished to make his highest and deepest declaration of himself to men and to enter into the closest and most intimate possible relationship with them, he was obliged—yes, one is prepared to put it thus strongly—to become incarnate, to become one of our own kind, to be held a Baby in the arms of the blessed Mother, to walk and live with us as Man, to live and die and rise again as Man—so that he could come to us richly, and so that we could receive him eventually as Spirit, by the Holy Spirit, because he had been amongst us and with us in our own human terms. The Incarnation as an historic moment in the relationship between God and man, therefore, is both part of and the quickening action in an incarnational universe, a sacramental world, in which man always lives by sacraments.

Every good reality in its degree is a sacred sign, or a sign of a sacred reality. But not each in the same degree. This is a world which in our experience is multiform, various, richly graded with all manner of difference and distinction. The star says something which the flower-petal cannot say; the delicate colouring of a cloud is symbolic and sacramental in a different sense from a man's action; some things are only very limited in their expressive power as also in their evocative potentialities, while others are very much more so, almost to the point (but never quite to it, even in the sacred humanity of our Lord) of being infinite in their evocative and expressive range. Furthermore, there is the fact of sin—a disagreeable fact to contemplate, but a real one nevertheless. There is evil in the world. There is, in another phrasing, disorderliness, maladjustment of vehicle to purpose, disproportion in the arrangements of the relatively good realities which makes them unworthy or evil; there is a radical dis-ease in man which in fact becomes the disease of original sin and leads to actual sinning because it involves an inordinate employment of desire (in theological language, "concupiscent") towards ends that are not finally good, with a perversion of the *sacra signa* into *signa inordinationis* or even into *signa inordinata*.

On the other hand, there are high points where total significance is given to the whole system of symbolic realities. The "great moments" of life, the supremely meaningful actions, the utterly beautiful forms, the contacts which most intimately relate us to others or to God—here are criteria for the whole system because here is the

coronation openly of that which in the smaller events and things and contacts has been secretly initiated.

Let us now turn from this general presentation of the natural sacramentalism of life and the world to the *sphere* or field, to use the language of contemporary physics, in which such extraordinary intensifications of the sacramental occur that we properly speak of the *supernatural* as involved in them. That field is the Church as the Body of Christ. And first it is essential to recognize that this term is used *aptly* as a description of the Church. Not only because St. Paul employed it, but also because it is the best way of picturing the relation of the Church to Christ, the term "Body" is to be applied to the fellowship of Christian believers. For as in his personal humanity our Lord, who is God the Word, had for his self-expression and for his evocative action among men a body that was the perfected vehicle for his divine purpose, so in the social humanity which came into being through his action and exists to carry him down through the centuries, he has a body which is in intention the perfected vehicle for his purpose and which is in its members on the way to increasing perfection as it more nearly *is* his vehicle. Despite the sin, the error and the weakness of its human members, the Church is therefore as the Body of Christ the true sacrament of the unseen yet really present and active Lord who is God-Made-man. I shall not continue in detail; suffice it to say that the term Body of Christ as applied to the Church must be taken as a metaphor, but taken *very seriously* as a metaphor, with the understanding that it is the only symbol adequate to express the truth about the Church. The Body of Christ is that continuing organic expression of the life of the God-Man which is informed by life-in-love because it is life-in-union; its head is the everlasting Christ, its informing life is the Holy Spirit who is the charity of God; its purpose is the incorporation of all life into Christ; its end is the return of the entire creation to God, so that he may be sacramentally expressed and active throughout the entire world-order by its free and glad surrender to his purpose, until all shall find itself in him.

Such a view of the Church makes quite impossible any purely mechanical or merely legal view. One need not agree with the extremes to which Dr. Walter Lowrie found himself led many years ago, but one must at least agree with his insistence that in the Church

organizational factors are secondary to organic. This does not at all mean that there are no mechanisms which are significant in and important to the Church, any more than recognition of the human body as a totally functioning organism implies that it possesses no salutary and necessary mechanisms or mechanical ways of normal healthy functioning. For myself, for instance, I should insist that the historic ministry of the Church is that mode of functioning which is "mechanical" in at least one sense—that it is actually intrinsic to the life of the Body. But it is not mechanical in the sense of being a detached, automatic, *merely* tactual succession which is taught. The historic ministry is itself a sacrament of a sacred thing, namely the historic continuity and the genuine identity of the Church as Body of Christ.

But it is important to assert plainly and flatly that the sacramental system of the Church, if that be a proper term at all, is a system only in the sense in which the human organism has certain systems or ways of functioning which are utterly essential to its true health, true persistence, true identity. The sacraments of the Church cannot be looked upon as a system in the sense of some merely mechanistic, legalistic, narrowly understood set of forms, which operate apart from or in some distinction from the Body of Christ. They *are* the Body of Christ at work in the world; that is their significance, and their only significance.

Here, as so often, I find myself drawn greatly towards the Eastern Orthodox view. But it is also noteworthy that the Liturgical Movement in the western church, and the writings of other theologians who are not themselves necessarily influenced by its ideals but are greatly concerned with the implications of the notion of the Body of Christ (as, for instance, Fr. Thornton in his recent book, *Common Life in the Body of Christ*), show a similar tendency to stress this organic notion of the sacramental system and to use for its description language which is neither mechanistic nor purely "spiritual", but quite plainly and frankly vitalistic. I admit that there is a danger in this biological emphasis, so common in our time; but I believe that it is the most fruitful and useful of all the ways of approaching a correct understanding of the Church and the sacraments, provided we never minimize the place of reason, on the one hand, nor tend towards a merely pragmatic sanction for our religious life, on the other.

We are now prepared to turn to the specific Christian sacraments, bearing in mind the definition given by Hugh of St. Victor. A sacrament in the particular Christian sense is a corporeal or material element which presents to the senses, shows by similarity, signifies by institution, and contains by consecration, a spiritual grace intended by God for man. There are some fundamental matters to be borne in mind here. The first is that the number of sacraments as seven was reached at a comparatively late date; while it is not arbitrary it is at least not entirely determinative. Institution by our Lord himself is the usual criterion, but as the result of modern biblical criticism it can hardly be affirmed with certainty that he instituted in any *formal* sense any of the sacraments, although (to employ the valuable Roman Catholic distinction) it may be said that all were instituted by him *in genere*—that is, by general intention, in his divine mind, of establishing a society in which man's salvation would be accomplished with the employment of such means as properly and directly developed from actions or words of his during the days of his flesh. The second point is that the efficiency—that is, the objective power or operation of God through the sacrament—depends on the divine will, given certainly in answer to prayer but given *by* God, and hence *assuredly* given when that is done which ought to be done to indicate the petition to which the grace is the answer. Hence the sacraments depend so on God's will (but on no human control of God's will, which is absurd) that they are effective *ex opere operato*. As in our general experience, in the realm of the naturally sacramental, the thing is done, and possesses its reality apart from our response, so in the specific Christian sacrament. Yet the element of appropriation, response, assimilation, is our own invaluable contribution; it is required for the "beneficial effect" on human receptivity—or, in ordinary language, for "worthy" reception. This is not magic, for in no sense at all is it suggested that man has control over the divine power, will or presence. It simply brings the Christian sacraments into line with our general experience in which, unless we are entirely projectionists in theory, we recognize that human response is made to what is actually *there*, to what is really done or present in the vast range of our human and physical environment.

A third matter to be mentioned is that sacraments must include the outward sign, which involves some material thing or action that suggests that there is an intention of the Church to convey grace,

and some words said—the form—which defines and states that intention. Sacraments must include also the inward part or grace—in the case of the Eucharist the *thing* itself (the Body and Blood of Christ), and in all the sacraments the grace which is objectively present but subjectively received. Sacraments also demand a competent minister—which means that they must be performed by one who as the representative or functioning agent of the Body of Christ has been appointed to perform this specific task. All this is part of that normal, orderly, healthy operation which, as I have suggested earlier, is as much a part of the Body as is, for instance, the skeletal or digestive system part of the human organism.

It remains to make some brief comments on the whole system.

First, I should wish to emphasize the aptness of the Christian sacramental system to the life of man. Living in a sacramental world, as himself a sacramental being, he is met in the Body of Christ with a way of religious expression and evocation which is natural to him. In this connection I delight in the word spoken by my revered master in theology, Dr. Marshall Bowyer Stewart: "It is ever most natural for the Supernatural to be known and to work naturally." The Church's sacraments are no adventitious or arbitrary intrusion into the world; they are what we might, *a priori*, have expected if Christianity be the true religion, and if it be based upon an action of God such as Christians assert occurred in the Incarnation.

Secondly, it is important to lay stress upon the social nature of the sacraments of the Christian Church. As the Church is the Body of Christ, so its sacraments are sacraments *of the Body*. They are effective only as being of the Body; they are worthily received only by those who are of the Body, either in intention or in fact. When St. Paul speaks of the dreadful consequences to be expected by those who receive the Lord's Supper without discerning the Lord's Body, I fancy that he was really saying that those who participate without true *social* participation, without brotherhood, without faithful membership in the mystical Body as at least intentional in their participation, eat and drink damnation—which, in William Morris's telling phrase, is "absence of fellowship." Such an insistence upon sociality is imperative above all in such sacraments as baptism, confirmation, orders, and penance; it is easy to see it in the others, perhaps, but it must be emphasized particularly in those sacraments which may seem to have a personal quality, but which in truth have that per-

sonal quality simply in the fact that they relate men, in one way or another, for one purpose or another, in response to one need or another, to the life of the total Body of Christ.

The sacraments of the Church have another singular quality—they parallel, with amazing precision, the great moments and the great needs in the lives of men. As men are born, so are they baptized into the family of God; as they grow up to need strengthening for full responsible action, so they are confirmed; as they fall into error and stray from the right, so they are shriven; as they require nourishment day by day to live nobly, and some cause to which they can give their lives, so they offer the Holy Sacrifice and receive Holy Communion; as they establish their own little communities of love and family care, so they marry with the blessing of God through the Church; as they are ill in body and presently must die, so they are anointed in body and prepared for the death of the body. Similarly, as they seek the more nearly to serve God, so they are called to a Christian vocation and in certain instances to a specific vocation in the Body of Christ as its ministers. For a discussion of this entire question, I refer to a noble book by Dietrich von Hildebrand, *Liturgy and Personality*.

I am deeply aware of the inadequacies of this paper. I have said nothing about the particular sacraments, by which we become very members incorporate in the mystical Body, by which we are strengthened, shriven, nourished. But doubtless the reader can furnish all this for himself. Let me close by remarking that it is the peculiar privilege of the Catholic Christian to live as a sacramental being in a world which is sacramental, to live by the sacraments of the Body of Christ in the Body which is the sacrament of Christ, to know life as sacramental, and to realize more deeply his own sacramental nature. If there were no other proof to be offered of the general truth of the Catholic position, this would seem to me to be almost enough to convince one of it. Miss Underhill, in her striking little book, *Man and the Supernatural*, wrote: "Through the Christian sacraments that self-giving, of which the Incarnation is the supreme example, finds another and continuous expression: sense here becoming the vehicle through which the very Spirit of life enters into the little lives of men." So intimately, so precisely, so entirely does this dovetail with our own general human experience, that it would be incredible for it not to be credible.

PROPOSITIONS IN SOLID THEOLOGY

By WALTER LOWRIE

Princeton, New Jersey

In arithmetic the mathematician deals with only one dimension, in plane geometry he deals with two, in solid geometry with three, and in some of the higher branches he is compelled to assume a fourth dimension. It can be easily seen that in choosing the title for this article I have in mind the difference between plane and solid geometry, and would suggest that, having had perhaps too much practice in plane or superficial theology, we might profitably begin to busy ourselves with solid or substantial theology. A theology which deals with only one dimension may be very subtle, yet it has no breadth. What I would call plane theology may be narrow or broad, but it has no depth. Solid theology, having length, breadth and thickness, is the only sort which is capable of dealing with the conceptions of the Bible. I would plead moreover with the theologians not to exclude *a priori* the possibility that, since they are dealing with the Bible, they may have to admit a fourth dimension, inasmuch as "the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are "eternal" (2 Cor. 4:18). I must confess that the analogy to which I have appealed is not perfect, since solid geometry too is superficial, inasmuch as it must begin by measuring the surfaces of objects—be they cubes, pyramids, parallelepipeds, or what not—all of which are shown in the diagrams as empty boxes, and its final task is merely to determine the amount such figures might contain, if they had any contents at all. On the other hand, propositions in solid theology are concerned with the quality and kind of contents found in *words*, which are containers of such a peculiar sort that they correspond precisely to the character of their contents.

Bishop Anders Nygren's *Commentary on Romans*,¹ which has recently been published in English, seems to me unsatisfactory both in form and content; and yet hardly any book has ever had so rousing

¹First published 1944: tr. by Carl C. Rasmussen, Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1949.

an influence upon me. It prompted me at once to write an article called "The Simple Gospel" (published in *Theology Today*, July, 1950), in which I called attention to the fact that in St. Paul's epistles, no less than in the Johannine writings, the Gospel is understood essentially as the promise of eternal life. If this is a fact, it cannot truly be said that Christians were for many centuries unable to understand what St. Paul called "my gospel." What they failed to understand was the subtle dialectic by which he sought to bolster his position. Perhaps no one understood it well before St. Augustine. It is notorious that the Protestant Reformers, beginning with Luther, made so much of this dialectic that they were disposed to find in this the essence of the Gospel. But did they rightly understand it when they treated it as plane geometry?

What set me off on this tangent was Bishop Nygren's translation of Rom. 1:17 ("Those who by faith are righteous shall live") and the emphasis he thereby places upon *life*. But the author himself does not seem to realize how revolutionary² this perception is. Life is a word so solid, so realistic, that it cannot be dealt with by plane theology. It is a word which cannot be used without pathos; for it indicates a dimension which all men know, though they cannot explain it, an experience which all men have, and which all men cling to, that they might have it in a higher power, "more abundant." I would point out now that every term used in Christian theology with an obvious or essential reference to life must be understood realistically. Dr. Nygren knows that Christian doctrine is thoroughly realistic, and he states this fact—not obscurely, perhaps I should say, yet not so clearly that one who runs can read. For (not to mention many incidental statements) he emphasizes as fundamental to St. Paul's belief the notion of the two aeons, the aeon of death and the aeon of life—a thought which is far too realistic for our modern taste. He capitalizes the words which describe these aeons (Darkness/Light, Wrath/Love, Sin/Righteousness, Condemnation/Mercy, etc.) to indicate that they too are real entities. He does not hesitate to agree with St. Paul that Christians are in a relationship of solidarity with Christ which is no less real than that which binds all men to Adam; and, as a good Lutheran, he finds this solidarity accom-

²It is also the translation found in the Revised Standard Version, 1946—i.e. "He who through faith is righteous shall live."

plished as well as expressed through the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

There can be no doubt that many things which we regard as abstract generalizations St. Paul regarded as concrete entities, propositions in solid theology. He regarded Sin as a mysterious power to which man is in subjection and in servitude, from which only God's power can deliver him. In this way he hypostatized Sin. Death he even personified when he regarded it as "the last enemy" (1 Cor. 15:26). We have to admit that Life is a substantial entity, and not merely our generalization of the phenomena observable in living beings; but to us Death is not an entity, it is merely the absence of Life. To us also Light is a reality (though it be not that which it seems), but Darkness is merely the absence of Light. We would not capitalize any of these words, but St. Paul did, in effect. And behind or in all the evil entities which St. Paul envisaged he discerned obscurely hostile spiritual Powers, understanding as he did that "our wrestling is not against flesh and blood (i.e. human enemies, whether within or without), but against Principalities, against Powers, against the World-Rulers of this Darkness." We do not have to rely exclusively upon Ephes. 6:12 to illustrate this character of St. Paul's thought, for in Col. 1:16 we have an emphatic reference to Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers, which presumably includes invisible powers working for righteousness. This is one of those problems in four-dimensional space which we try in vain to solve by plane geometry, as though such notions had no thickness or depth.

It will doubtless be said at this point, and it can be said with some plausibility, that, if such is the character of St. Paul's thought, if it takes seriously the fantastic creations of his own mind, it cannot properly be called realistic. Well, rather than contend about words, I am ready to admit that we have no word which adequately describes the veridical character of such thinking. But, granting that it does not possess the sort of reality we associate with real estate and other palpable realities, it is evident at least that it stands at the greatest possible remove from what Hamann called "the purism of pure reason," from the whole tendency of idealistic philosophy to deal with words instead of things. St. Paul reminds us that there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy; and, besides assuming that the things which are not seen are eternal, he asserts paradoxically that "the invisible things of God

since the creation of the world are clearly visible, being perceived through the things that are made, even his eternal power and divinity" (Rom. 1:20). And to me it is evident that, if St. Paul would attach more than a superficial meaning to the great words he employs to make known the mind of God, he must resort to myth—a word which I do not use disparagingly. St. Paul, like other Biblical writers, deals with concepts which are massive, solid, substantial—to the abstraction with which philosophers prefer to deal. Because from which we are inclined to shy away. To us the Biblical conception of the Spirit seems, as we would say, "unspiritual," because it is said to be "poured out", and we are expected to "drink" it. Even the Biblical conception of God seems crude to us who are accustomed home in the world of Biblical realism and did not scruple to present he was nothing of a philosopher John Bunyan was the only modern theologian (if I may apply to him this title) who was thoroughly at the truth in a mythical form. The surprising fact that *The Pilgrim's Progress* is now more highly prized by Roman Catholics than by Protestants may perhaps be explained by the consideration that Catholics, though they are supposed not to know the Bible as well as we, have actually retained notable traces of Biblical realism.

Bishop Nygren has illuminating perceptions of Biblical realism, but he does not perceive (or does not wish to make it plain) how revolutionary and explosive they are. They are revolutionary, not with regard to the apostolic Scriptures, as though these might be threatened, but with regard to the modern interpretation of the Scriptures. By modern I do not mean only the most recent interpretations; for the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century only exaggerated the fundamental misunderstanding exemplified by the Scholastic theologians of the thirteenth century. The bias of Greek thought, though it had less influence than is commonly attributed to it upon the composition of the New Testament, had a strong tendency to warp the interpretation of both the Old Testament and the New by suppressing the traits of Biblical realism in which Goldberg describes *Die Wirklichkeit der Hebräer*, but which to our mind seem a crass sort of realism. It was inevitable that, under the influence of Greek rationalism which characterized the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the Protestant Reformers, especially in the Reformed branch which stemmed from John Calvin, who was an eminent exponent of the Revival of Learning, Holy Scripture should be

misunderstood as an elegant example of rational theology which is acquainted only with the reaches of plane geometry. This is shown most plainly by Zwingli's treatment of the sacraments as mere symbols, which has prevailed in the Reformed Churches in spite of Calvin's mild protest.

St. Paul's dialectic shows that he was a man of high intellectual gifts, but he is misunderstood when he is regarded as an intellectualist. No more than the other apostles did he profess to be dealing exclusively with an intelligible world. He dealt with mysteries, which to him were perfectly real, but were established only by faith.

Here again I refer to the perceptions of Biblical realism which occur occasionally in Dr. Nygren's commentary, but are not pressed to a revolutionary conclusion. From them I infer positions which are partly independent but are of the same magnitude and are supported by the same reasoning. I shall speak of them later. But here it needs to be remarked that their importance cannot be reckoned by simple arithmetical addition. The value increases in a geometrical ratio; and though the items are few, since they cannot be more numerous than the key words of St. Paul's theology, the cumulative effect is prodigious—I would say, explosive and revolutionary. When I was a boy and we were permitted to play with fire-crackers on the Fourth of July, we distinguished disparagingly the "sizzlers" from the well-made fire-crackers which exploded with a sharp detonation. There are sizzlers scattered here and there in Bishop Nygren's book. My notion is that, if they were heaped together, they would go off with a loud bang. When they are scattered they hardly sizzle. Here is one example among many. On page 183 it is said incidentally, "God has made us who were dead alive in Christ. *Concisely put, this is the meaning of justification.*" If Dr. Nygren had emphasized by italics the words I have emphasized here, the cracker would have gone off. But it is only a dud; and a dud, however full it may be of explosive material, cannot go off without a detonator. I am the detonator. I claim only that humble role.

My affirmation is that all the key words of St. Paul's theology—or I would say rather of apostolic theology as a whole—are thoroughly realistic. He is not dealing with words as counters, but with the things themselves. And the realism is most clearly manifested by the relation they have to life, which is the most realistic word in the Bible.

The reference to eternal life is obvious in the proclamation of the kingdom of God, with which even in the Synoptic Gospels it is equated. No one can fail to recognize that in the Gospel of St. John everything revolves about the promise of eternal life. But this is true also of St. Paul's Gospel. The reference to eternal life is abundantly plain in every utterance about the sons, the children, the heirs of God, and therefore in the word adoption. It ought to be clear enough that salvation in its highest sense means deliverance from death unto life. We have seen that justification is a summary expression for eternal life. This is more obviously true of righteousness of God (e.g. 2 Cor. 5:21). Righteousness, being "*wrought by God*" (Rom. 1:16), cannot be regarded as a *habitus* acquired by man or the formal decision of the divine Judge who arbitrarily declines to pass sentence upon a transgressor. It is more real than that, it is the possession of life.

I do not propose even to mention here all the terms which might be adduced to show that the theology of St. Paul, like that of St. John, though less evidently, was organized around the promise of eternal life and is systematic only in this relation. For no one can reasonably expect to find in this short article more than a few suggestions which point towards a revolution in theology. Though I aim to produce a few sharp detonations, I make no effort in this slight paper to support against attack positions which I here announce from a modest pulpit, but do not now, in this small arena, propose to maintain against all opponents, as though I had entered the lists in full armor and were brandishing my lance defiantly.

But in conclusion I desire to say something about the word "glory," as St. Paul used it in relation to both God and man. I dwell at some length upon this one word because all men ought to know, and only because of what may be called religious illiteracy do not know, that St. Paul was accustomed to spell eternal life ("concisely," Nygren would say) with the letters G, L, O, R, Y. This is a consoling and uplifting thought to those who desire life—only if they can be assured of having it more abundantly. What I would say now I cannot express better than I did three years ago in the Foreword to my *Art in the Early Church*. The conclusion of this foreword was written at a time when I was compelled to set my affections upon things above. My situation at that time, like that experienced by many other men and women, is perfectly described

by what St. Paul said of himself in 2 Cor. 1:8-10: "We were weighed down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life: yea, we ourselves had the sentence of death written within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God which raiseth the dead, who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver: on whom we have set our hope that he will still deliver us."

What follows here without quotation marks is actually quoted from that foreword (pp. xvi—xviii), but with slight omissions and additions which make it more intelligible in this connection.

Instead of the word *Majestas*, which archaeologists use for representations of Christ enthroned as Judge and Saviour of the world, I prefer to use *Doxa*, a Greek word, which is also the Biblical word used to denote the glory of Christ, a divine glory, which early Christian artists detected (as did St. John) even "in the days of his flesh." Glory means much more than earthly majesty, more than the majesty of imperial Caesar. Therefore the early artists were not content to represent Christ as King: they depicted him as "the Lord of glory." It was a misunderstanding on the part of the Wise Men who came from the east to do obeisance to a king. It was a misunderstanding on the part of Pilate when to the Cross he affixed the inscription THE KING OF THE JEWS. This was not true, although it was written in three languages. St. Paul better described what was done when he said, "They crucified the Lord of glory"! The new festival of Christ the King is also a misunderstanding, although it is a misunderstanding that I applauded because modern art, especially in Protestantism, has made Christ less than that.

Glory (*doxa*) belongs properly to God, yet Christians were encouraged to cherish the extravagant hope of sharing the divine glory. The sepulchral art of the early days sought by every means to depict this "hope of glory," "the glory which shall be revealed in us," who, beholding the image of Christ as in a mirror, are "transformed into the same image, from glory to glory." By a figure so inadequate as the celestial banquet early Christian art sought to represent "what eye hath not seen, neither ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to believe, the things that God hath prepared for them that love him." In the midst of the corruption of the tombs it ventured to promise that we "shall be raised in glory," and it sought to vindicate, as subsequent art has hardly essayed to do, the truth of

St. Paul's declaration that "to depart and be with Christ is far better." One who has just learned to read may be surprised, as I was, to discover how prominent and how pervading in the New Testament is "the hope of the glory of God." Athanasius affirmed nothing more when he said, "God became man in order that men might become gods." This is what it means to be "heirs" or "sons" or "children of God." We are commonly too modest in our aspirations. But what else can we mean by "the resurrection of the dead," if by this we mean anything more than the precarious Platonic wager on "the immortality of the soul"? The Platonic doctrine of immortality contemplates only one dimension, inasmuch as it understands by eternity only the infinite prolongation of time—a notion which Hegel stigmatized as *die schlechte Ewigkeit*, spurious eternity. According to the Bible, time is swallowed up in eternity, as death, according to St. Paul's trenchant saying, "is swallowed up in victory." The true eternity is glory.

Men who have not learned to read, glibly affirm that apocalyptic eschatology was generally discarded before the end of the second century. But if it is easy to overlook the evidence of eschatology in early Christian literature, it is not possible to ignore a factor which was so prominent in early Christian art. It was in fact by the fascination of the heavenly hope that Christianity outbid not only paganism but also Judaism. "Spare the one and only hope of the human race" was Tertullian's appeal to a Roman emperor. *Fascinans* is the word Rudolf Otto employed to indicate one of the principal notes of religion. This note was plainly manifested in early Christian art, and with it the other note, the *tremendum*, was associated in every representation of Christ in Glory, as at once the Judge and the Saviour of the world. It is as an expression of the *fascinans* that so much emphasis is placed upon the sacraments in early Christian art. For the experience of "spiritual gifts" (*charismata*) was regarded as "the earnest of our inheritance." Those who have not yet learned to read cannot get it through their heads that the sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, might have anything to do with eschatology, i.e. with the hope of eternal life.

THE PROPOSED REVISION OF OUR LITURGY

I. BAPTISM

By CYRIL C. RICHARDSON
Union Theological Seminary

By publishing the results of their learned deliberations the Liturgical Commission has put us all in their debt.¹ They have proposed many revisions which are sound and which will doubtless commend themselves to the Church at large. They have also asked for frank criticism; and it will certainly be well, whatever final revisions we adopt, for many to undertake a detailed appraisal of their work.

With us liturgical revision is a very serious issue. For the Prayer Book is a source of doctrine as well as of prayer. Hence even slight modifications, which on the surface may appear innocuous, must be very carefully examined. We can suffer no attempt to alter the Church's teaching; nor would it be wise for us, in interests of modern liturgy alone, to make changes where we have clear expressions of Catholic truth. We have to weigh the claims of modernity against those of tradition, and to remember that our aim is not merely to phrase useful services but to express, in forms of prayer, the truth which the Church teaches.

It appears to me a sound principle that we should entertain no changes unless (a) a real defect in our present rites is remedied, either by reference to antiquity or to present need, (b) the proposed revision is theologically sound, and as strong in expressing Christian truth as the phrases it is to replace, (c) it is clearly better in phraseology, clarifying an obscurity, rectifying a misunderstanding or providing understanding where none at present exists.

In this last connexion, however, I feel it unwise to modernize language at all costs. The present revisions, as we shall see, have an aversion to the word 'regenerate'. They wish to say "born anew" or "spiritually reborn", as if this were more intelligible to the modern

¹Prayer Book Studies: I. *Baptism and Confirmation*. Church Pension Fund, N. Y., 1950.

man. But it surely is to be doubted if this is so. Modern people may well have difficulty with *all* these words and the doctrine they imply. But I simply cannot believe that one who knows what to be born again means, could possibly be in doubt of the sense of 'regenerate'. We are far from hesitant to adopt all the jargon of modern psychology; and 'regenerate' is surely a more simple and expressive word than many that are now becoming popular from that realm. We do not need to deplete the Christian vocabulary of sound words: what we rather need is better teaching about their meaning. Basic English may be useful for the traveller; but there is no need to use it in the Prayer Book.

I have two other general suggestions to make before passing to the Baptismal Office. It would certainly help *if the revisions could be printed in parallel columns with the present text*, and the new material italicized. While this would raise the price of the books, it would help those who do not want to go to the tedious trouble of comparing different volumes, to get a rough picture of what is involved in the proposals. Small changes of wording can be so easily overlooked, if one has to refer to separate books and there is no indication (as by italics) of a change.

I think, too, the Liturgical Commission might circulate their proposals to some experts (bishops, parish priests, professors, etc.) *in mimeographed form*, before printing them. There are many things in the present booklets which are so unlikely to gain acceptance, that they could easily have been modified by such a procedure. We would, I think, get something more likely to win the Church's final approval, were the initial responses of some hundred or more prominent priests elicited.

Aims of the Revisers

Let us now turn to our main theme—the Baptismal revisions. The revisers have some five aims in view.

(1) To provide more suitable rubrics at the beginning. (On the whole these are excellent and meet very practical needs.)

(2) To shorten the service. This they have done by dropping the alternate lection from John 3 (which appears to me as unnecessary as it is unwise); by omitting the bidding and prayer after the lection (which, while good, leaves a poor transition to the promises); and by deleting the bidding before the Lord's Prayer and Thanksgiving (which is a serious omission indeed).

(3) To rework the Promises. (On the whole this is very well done).

(4) To provide a prayer for the Sponsors (an excellent suggestion; but, coming at the end of the service, it is in a poor place, and its opening address is a little odd).

(5) To engage in considerable rewording. (Most, if not all, of these changes do not seem to me necessary, and a number of them are open to criticism.)

The Structure of the Rite

To make clear all that is involved in these criticisms it will be necessary to go through the rite in detail. We must, however, begin with some observations on its general structure.

Our present rite is well compiled, and its structure is coherent. Yet it is very repetitious; and there is no question it should be shortened. Baptism, as the revisers insist, should be at the 11 A.M. Sunday Service. Accordingly it needs abbreviation. Here in parallel columns, is the structure of the present rite and that of the revisers:

<i>Present Rite</i>	<i>Proposed Revision</i>
(1) Preface and Prayer	Preface and Prayer
(2) 3 Alternate Lections	2 Alternate Lections
(3) Preface and Prayer	
(4) Promises and Prayer	Promises and Versicles and Prayer
(5) Sursum Corda and Blessing of the Font	Sursum Corda and Blessing of the Font
(6) Baptism	Baptism
(7) Preface, Lord's Prayer and Thanksgiving	Lord's Prayer and Thanksgiving
	Prayer for Sponsors
(8) Benediction	Benediction

A glance at this table will show at once that the amount of abbreviation the revisers have obtained is somewhat small. They have added two items (Versicles, Prayer for Sponsors), and subtracted only three. Yet they have accomplished something by removing the bidding and prayer after the lection. By this they avoid saying twice (and again before the Promises, which makes three times), what we are doing in Baptism, thus repeating the exordium.

The difficulty, however, with their scheme lies in the transition to the Promises. This our present rite does quite well. After the lesson there is a bidding and prayer referring to the Gospel and point-

ing toward the Promises. These appropriately begin, "Ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ etc.", the opening clauses looking back to the prayer.

But in the revision, as soon as the lesson is over, the priest begins, "Dearly beloved, we have *prayed* unto God our Father etc."—the reference going back to the prayer *before* the lesson. This is extremely awkward.

If we are going to cut out the bidding and prayer after the lesson, it is essential to put the lesson *at the very beginning*. This has many advantages—not least that at Eucharists where there are baptisms the Epistle and Gospel could both be *propers*, dealing with baptism. Similarly the lessons in Morning Prayer could be especially chosen on that topic.² The Exordium would thus immediately follow the Gospel or Second Lesson, and there would be no duplication of lections as at present.³

The other weakness in the revisers' structure is the place of the prayer for Sponsors. Tag ends to genuine conclusions are a curse in all liturgies—Eastern as well as Western. After the thanksgiving comes the *end*. The rest is only an anti-climax. Even some of our own priests (despite the rubrics) have a habit of inserting prayers before the Eucharistic benediction. At a recent Conference in Maria Laach Romanist experts advised doing away with post-Communion devotions such as the Last Gospel. It is a step in the right direction. So far as Baptism goes, the prayer for Sponsors belongs *after the Promises*. More of this later.

Finally, on structure, I do not see the sense of having the Lord's Prayer interjected between a bidding and a thanksgiving. That is an evil of our present rite, and goes back, I suppose, to the bad habit of saying the *Pater Noster* during the silence after medieval biddings. Let us have the silence, as in the old intercessions of bidding, silence and collect, and not misuse the Lord's Prayer in that way. The preface to the thanksgiving leads naturally into the thanksgiving itself. It is surely to be regretted that the revisers deleted the bidding and left the Lord's Prayer—a point to which I shall return later.

²Certainly Exodus 14 could be used, as in the Early Church.

³The revisers suggest omitting one lesson and a Canticle at Morning or Evening Prayer, when there are baptisms (Rubric 3). This does not help Eucharists; and, as I have said, it puts the baptismal lection in an awkward place.

The structure, then, I suggest is this:

- (1) Lessons (normally Epistle and Gospel of the Eucharist; or first and second lesson of Morning Prayer where 11 a.m. Eucharists have not been instituted).
- (2) Preface and Prayer.
- (3) Promises and Prayer.
- (4) Sursum Corda and Blessing of the Font.
- (5) Baptism.
- (6) Preface and Thanksgiving.
- (7) Benediction.

Apart from being more logical than that proposed, this order has the advantage of additional brevity.

Let us now turn to the details of the rite.

The Rubrics

The revision of the rubrics is ably done, and I think they will be welcomed by the Church. Three minor changes might be made, however. The wording of the first rubric could be simplified by using "in order that" for the awkward phrase "as well for that". "And that" (lower down) should replace "as also that in the Baptism of infants", which is unnecessarily lengthy.

I have already suggested a revision of the third rubric on the lections.

I think, too, that a rubric should retain the emphasis on baptism not being repeated. The revisers have rightly deleted the opening question of the service, "Has this child been already baptised, or no?" It is a poor and unnecessary beginning of a rite, and the superstitious custom of baptising children several times no longer obtains with us. But it might be well to have a rubric about it.

Section (1): *Preparation*

The revisers have left the Exordium as it is, but have added a tag at the very end to bring it into conformity with the following prayer. The tag is, "an an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven". I see no point in this, other than the anxiety of an over-tidy mind.

The prayer which follows has been considerably reworded, with the intention of bettering it by reference to the original in the Gregorian Sacramentary (H. D. Wilson's edition, p. 161). It seems to me Cranmer is preferable for several reasons, though I do not deny that a few changes in Cranmer's version might profitably be made.

Here in parallel columns are Cranmer's prayer and the proposed revision:

Cranmer

Almighty and immortal God, the aid of all who need, the helper of all who flee to thee for succour, the life of those who believe, and the resurrection of the dead;

We call upon thee for this Child (this thy Servant), that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of sin, by spiritual regeneration.

Receive him, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask, and ye shall have; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. So give now unto us who ask; let us who seek, find; open the gate unto us who knock; that this Child (this thy Servant) may enjoy the everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing, and may come to the eternal kingdom which thou hast promised by Christ our Lord. Amen.

Revision (changes in italics)

Almighty and immortal God, *the helper and defender of all who call to thee in need, the life and peace of those who believe;*

We call upon thee for this Child (this thy Servant), that he, coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of sin, *and thine eternal grace of spiritual birth.*

Receive him, O Lord, as thou hast promised by thy well-beloved Son, saying, Ask and ye shall have; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. So give now unto us who ask; let us who seek, find; open the gate unto us who knock; that this Child (this thy Servant), *being born anew, may be received into the company of Christ's flock, and may come into his inheritance of the eternal kingdom of thy Son, Jesus Christ our Lord.* Amen.

The first thing we note is the serious omission of the reference to God as "the resurrection of the dead". The revisers explain (p. 17) that this is inappropriate since baptisms are no longer usually at Eastertide. We shall see later that they have similarly deleted the symbolism of dying and rising with Christ in the prayer after the Promises and in the Thanksgiving. It is hard to realize that this has happened, but it is true nevertheless. I simply do not see that because baptisms are not held at Easter, they cease to have Easter meaning. I do not think of God as "the resurrection from the dead" only on Easter day. Since dying and rising is the very essence of baptism and of the Christian life, this epithet of God is rightly the climactic one in the opening prayer addressed to Him.

In trying to better Cranmer's rendering of the five epithets of God in this opening part of the prayer, the revisers have fallen into further difficulties. The original Latin is quite beautiful. It does not call God "Helper" or "Defender" but uses these five simple words in apposition, "help", "release", "peace", "life" and "resurrection". Even Cranmer with his fine sense of language used "helper", instead of "help", which would have preserved the nice balance. Anyway, the revisers have done worse than Cranmer. They have added "defender", conjoined "life" and "peace" and left out the "resurrection". The whole effect is unhappy. If the Latin should be abbreviated we could say, "Immortal God, the help and peace of those who pray to thee, the life of those who believe and the resurrection of the dead". Or else let us leave Cranmer, merely changing "helper" to "help".

We then proceed to the phrase about "remission of sin by spiritual regeneration". This appears in the revision as "remission of sin and thine eternal grace of spiritual birth". It is contended this is nearer the Latin (p. 17), which it is not. The Latin is: "desires to receive eternal grace by spiritual regeneration". Cranmer substituted "remission of sin" for "eternal grace" because, for him, as for all the Reformers, the chief—indeed, the *only*, grace was remission of sin, in contrast to the Catholic view. But whether we take Cranmer's version or the Latin, *it makes sense*. The gift is *dependent on* regeneration. But the revisers, by making the gift of regeneration co-ordinate with that of forgiveness (something on which they seem to pride themselves, p. 17), ruin the sense and involve themselves in tautology.

In the conclusion of the prayer the revisers stumble again. Both the Latin and Cranmer lead up to the climax of the "heavenly washing"—an appropriate thought for baptism. But the revisers do not seem to like the word "washing". They change it around to "being born anew" (which is not so effective), and conclude with two awkward uses of the word "of", introducing "inheritance", which is neither in Cranmer nor in the Latin. Just what advantage all this has over Cranmer, I fail to see. If they do not like the phrase "everlasting benediction of thy heavenly washing", they could say "the lasting blessing of heavenly cleansing". There is no reason, moreover, to change the final reference to the kingdom. On the whole, they would have been well advised to leave the prayer alone.

It seems to me that the real difficulty with this prayer is one which has escaped the revisers. *It is the absence of a reference to the Holy Spirit, which is received in baptism.* This theme, mentioned in the bidding, does not appear in our present rite until the prayer after lection. Now the revisers, as we have seen, have with good reason deleted this prayer after the lesson. Thus we should do well to insert a reference to the Holy Spirit in the opening prayer. In consequence I would recast the final petition thus: "that this Child may receive the Holy Ghost by being born again through thy heavenly washing." This catches up the three themes of the Exordium—the Spirit, the new birth, and the water.

Section (2): *Lections*

Of the lections and their place I have already spoken. There is no good reason to delete John 3 as an alternate Gospel, and it should be left as it is at present.

Section (3): *Promises*

The Promises have been thoroughly reworded. I have nothing but commendation for the second part of them, which succinctly indicates the responsibilities of sponsors, a point in which our present rite is defective.

The first part of the revised Promises refers back in an awkward way to the prayer before the lesson, as I have already shown. For myself, I think they should begin as at present: "Dearly beloved, you have brought this Child here to be baptized," and then, without repeating what has already been prayed for, proceed immediately to the actual questions. This initial introduction, which the revisers have cut out, appears to me sensible and practical, since it states *why* these particular people are taking the promises.

By trying to provide a single set of promises applicable (in the first part) both to sponsors and to adults being baptized, the revisers have introduced a lack of clarity. I do not see how we can avoid two different phrasings of the promises, to suit the two different classes of people involved. Nor do I see that this is in any way objectionable. It is necessary for clarity and for expressing the different intentions of sponsors and adults. We have to make clear that the sponsors take the promises in the child's name.

I would suggest, therefore, a phrasing like this:

"Dearly beloved, you have brought this child to be baptized: Do you, therefore, in *his* name, renounce the devil and all his works, the

covetous desires and vainglory of the world, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that you will not follow or be led by them?"

The rewording of this paragraph in our present rite is not essential, but the omission of "pomp" and the avoidance of the awkward phrase, "covetous desires of the same", are defensible. But the wording the revisers give, seems open to objection. It omits the "sinful desires of the flesh", and substitutes "evil desires" both for this and for covetousness. The original phrases are more pointed and strong. The revisers add "by God's help", which, apart from being unnecessary, loses the point of the response, where it should be first introduced.

The revisers then substitute for the question about the Apostles' Creed, one about belief in the Trinity. This appears to me a very good suggestion. But in the fourth question they have, "and serve him all the days of thy life" for Cranmer's "and walk in the same all the days of thy life". This is the kind of change in wording which is unintelligible. It adds nothing important and destroys the balance of the original.

The next section, which the revisers have addressed to the sponsors, is altogether admirable; and might well supplant our present form.

For adults, I should urge a wording like this:

"Well-beloved, you have come hither desiring to receive holy baptism: Do you, therefore, renounce etc." in accordance with the four questions we have already treated.

I may add that in all these questions we should do well to substitute "you" for "ye" and "thou". The latter is only appropriate now as an address to God.

The revisers have next added versicles and responses which are good since they involve the participation of the congregation.

The prayer after these has been reworked, and is a very poor substitute for our present form. Not only does it omit the dying and rising theme, but it lacks the strength of the four petitions we now have. I suggest that we keep the first three of these, but rework the fourth into a prayer for the sponsors. That would be the appropriate place for such a petition—not as a tag at the end of the service. It might go like this:

"Grant that thy servants who have made these promises in the

name of this child, may bring him up in thy faith and fear and love. Through Jesus Christ our Lord."

The reason for deleting Cranmer's fourth petition is that it does not add anything significant to the preceding petitions. It is unduly long and an anticlimax.

Section (4): *Blessing of the Font*

The reworking of the blessing of the font is somewhat unhappy. In my opinion it does not need to be changed at all, unless we alter "regard the supplications of thy congregation", to "hear the prayers of thy people", which is simpler (as the revisers suggest). But their deletion of the water and blood symbolism of the Passion, appears to me unwise. It is defended on the ground that no one knows exactly what John meant (p. 17). But even if this is true, it is insufficient reason to omit it. It is quite gripping symbolism, and there can be little doubt that John intended some reference to the two sacraments. We often do not appreciate sufficiently the importance of symbolism in the faith; and it is rather more teaching about it than less reference to it that we need.

There are two other cases of rewording. In one case the revisers have substituted "may grow in thy grace and favour" for "may receive the fulness of thy grace". This is supported by the contention that "the fulness of thy grace" is not clear. It has also been changed in view of the prevailing controversy about the relative gifts of baptism and confirmation. Considering, however, what has already been prayed for in the rite, I feel the change is unnecessary. Receiving the Spirit surely cannot mean anything less than reception of the fulness of God's grace in principle. However, if, as I shall say later on Confirmation, we can gain a clear distinction between this rite and baptism, perhaps such a change as is here suggested can be defended.

The revisers have also changed, "remain in the number of thy faithful children", to "come into thine Everlasting Kingdom". There is no point in this, save that it destroys the symbolism of new birth and becoming as a little child.

Section (5): *Baptism*

The revisers have happily left untouched the section on the actual baptism.

Section (6): *Thanksgiving*

The preface to the thanksgiving has been deleted. This is a serious omission, and it must surely be restored. Not only is it a good practice to have prefaces (with intervening silence) for prayers, but the declaration which it makes about *what has been done* in baptism, is of great theological importance. It makes abundantly clear that a Catholic and not a Zwinglian doctrine marks our liturgy.

The revisers have retained the Lord's Prayer. As I have already observed, this could well be dispensed with. It interrupts the sequence of preface and thanksgiving, and goes back to the bad habit of saying the *Pater Noster* after medieval biddings. What there should be in this place is a moment of silence.

The thanksgiving has been reworked to exclude the symbolism of dying and rising with Christ, and to incorporate material from the omitted prayer after the lesson. It does not commend itself. There is no reason whatever for changing the excellent prayer we have at present (though "rest" may be substituted for "residue"). This thanksgiving says succinctly all that needs to be said; and the benediction (not a prayer for sponsors) should immediately follow.

Conclusion

The reader who has followed this tedious and detailed survey, is due a terse summary of what the author thinks should be kept from the proposed revision, and a table of what he feels might be a good revision of our office. Here they are:

What we should keep from the Proposed Revision

- (1) The opening Rubrics (change slightly 1 and 3 and add one).
- (2) The deletion of the opening question and of the preface and prayer after the lesson.
- (3) The questions on the Trinity, the whole second part of the promises for sponsors, and the versicles and responses.
- (4) A prayer for sponsors (but a different prayer in a different place).

All these seem to me steps in the right direction.

Summary of Author's Proposals

- (1) Delete opening question and start with the lections. (Normally these will be propers for the Eucharist or Morning Prayer).
- (2) Keep present Exordium: slightly modify opening prayer to stress gift of the Spirit (or keep as is).

(3) Delete preface and prayer after lesson. Pass immediately to promises.

(4) Modify the Promises. In first part delete repetition of what has been prayed for. Use revisers' questions on Trinity, and whole of revisers' paragraph referring to sponsors.

Have a different set of Promises for sponsors and adults to be baptized.

Add revisers' versicles and responses.

Keep present prayer after Promises, but rework fourth petition into one for sponsors.

(5) Keep Sursum Corda and Blessing of Font as at present. (Possible minor change of wording).

(6) Keep baptism formulas as at present.

(7) Keep preface, delete Lord's Prayer, keep present thanksgiving. (Possible minor change of wording).

(8) Benediction as at present.

The changes proposed are small. They do, however, have the advantages of abbreviating the service, rectifying present defects and keeping intact a priceless heritage.

(To be continued)

MIRACLE AND NATURAL LAW IN THE AGE OF THE FATHERS

By NOAH E. FEHL

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought. By Robert M. Grant. Amsterdam: North Holland Pub. Co., 1952, pp. 293. \$4.50.

This study of the several attitudes, perspectives, and beliefs of the Hellenistic mind regarding miracles attempts to clarify the patristic concepts of the natural and the supernatural in the Gospel of the God-Man through whose incarnation, death, and resurrection man's salvation was accomplished. Professor Grant's approach to his task presupposes that Christian thought can be best understood when it is seen in the context of pagan and Jewish Hellenistic science, philosophy, and theology. All three disciplines were logically and his-

torically involved in the classical concept of natural law. Part I of this study (Science) identifies and traces the several uses of "natural law" as they emerged from the investigation of the physical world, beginning with the Ionian physicists, and the science of man, beginning with the Sophists and Socrates (chh. I, II). Despite the variety of perspectives, methods, and theories, two "laws of nature" (ch. III) dominate classical science and philosophy. One is the eternity of matter (Aristotle's material cause) and the other is the regularity of natural processes (Aristotle's final cause). These principles determine the scientific and philosophic critique of the miraculous. Chapters IV "Credibility" and V "Credulity" deal with the criteria of classical historiography and factors contributing to the ambivalence of the Hellenistic mind in its taste for both the rational and the irrational. With the beginning of the patristic period Grant finds a revival of credulity. The concluding chapters of Part I discuss the shifting balance in education between the encyclical or preparatory and the philosophic disciplines pointing up the speculative nature of Greek science and its dependence upon philosophy (ch. VI) which to some extent explains the expressions of practical interest in magic and pseudo-science in the pagan world and the limited knowledge of and interest in natural phenomena in Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity (ch. VII) and the hostile attitude toward science in Christianity (ch. VIII).

In dealing with the miraculous in their own tradition (Part II) Christian apologists and theologians were guided by two fundamental doctrines: the omnipotence of God and the creation of the world *ex nihilo*. These expressions of faith determined the Christian critique of the classical principles of matter and motion and enabled the Fathers to divine the revealing of the supernatural in the natural in a physical environment that was open to the purposes of its Creator. Regarding particular incidents of the miraculous in Scripture several tendencies of interpretation are traced. Divine omnipotence was by the prophets qualified by divine righteousness and redemptive concern for man. Where the miraculous revealed primarily the power apart from the righteousness of God it was of little interest to the prophets. Similarly in patristic literature the merely miraculous was infrequently regarded as a proof of the Gospel. At one extreme of the patristic defense of the faith stood Tertullian with his argument of credibility based on absurdity and at the other stood Origen with

his discrimination between literal truth and allegory based upon his notion of *theoprepes* and his judgment that "not everything in Scripture is the record of God's acts" (chh. XI and XII). The classical Christian resolution Grant finds in the thought of Augustine "with its stress on creation, miracle, and resurrection . . . bound together in a common theme, the omnipotence of God." The only qualification of this omnipotence is the divine nature itself. God's power is not qualified by the physical universe. "There is no fixed system through which God has to break, for the will of God is the origin of the order in nature" (p. 263). A final chapter, "Theology and Science," relates the patristic tension between the Greek and Hebrew views of the natural and supernatural to the issues of contemporary faith, rejecting the notions that the appeal of the miraculous is the expression of skepticism (Reinhold Niebuhr), that the historicity of signs and portents is irrelevant for faith alone must decide (Alan Richardson) and the form criticism of Bultmann which turns away from the resurrection so that the "Easter-Faith" may not suffer loss. Richard Kroner, on the other hand, Grant quotes with approval pointing to a more adequate solution for the modern Christian in the view that "miracles happen on a level of meaning where the laws of nature have no place at all."

Both the strength and weakness of the study are to be found in its author's interest in detail. Some selectivity could have been exercised under the discipline of a better organized typological approach to the vast field of Graeco-Roman thought. He seems, particularly in the first part of his book, to be preoccupied with the satisfaction of raking in the learned dust. Greater clarity could have been given to the principles of the patristic use and rejection of the notion of natural law if closer attention had been given to the divisions of their apologetic task drawn by the Fathers themselves. From Minucius Felix and Clement of Alexandria to Augustine there is an explicit threefold division of which natural theology with its corollary of natural law is the middle stage, being on the one hand the basis for the critique of pagan beliefs and practices (including the miraculous and magic) and on the other the foundation upon which the credibility of the Gospel is built. Tertullian does not invoke his faith in divine omnipotence when he is dealing with the "sacred tales" of paganism. Here he follows the arguments and the principles of natural law and rationalistic historiography. In discussing Christian revelation he

asks, "What has Jerusalem to do with Athens?" but it is from the same mind that we have our classic patristic statement concerning the universal witness of the religious consciousness and the praise of nature and its laws as the pre-eminent instructors of the soul. It is a clear principle, a *regula*, he insists, that "all properties of God must be rational, just as they are natural" (*Adv. Marcion.*, i. 10; 23; *De Test. Animae*, 5; *De Spec.*, 20; *Apol.* 8). This same ambivalent attitude toward nature and reason runs through the whole of the Christian literature of the first three centuries. What is the central principle of interpretation of the miraculous appears in this literature to be neither the doctrine of divine omnipotence nor any determinative notion of natural law but rather a mind illumined by the ultimate revelation of God in Christ providing a new apprehension of the sacred that enables the Fathers to divine the supernatural in the natural, to distinguish between fabulous tales and the luminous hand of God in nature and history. This fact may have been obscured by the almost exclusive emphasis of this study upon the last division of Christian apologetics and by the failure to deal as adequately with pagan and Jewish-Christian historiography as with science and philosophy. Two scientific examples of the latter are the neglect in dealing with Philo's discussion of the charismatic personality to consider his *Hypothetica* along with his *Vita Mosis* and the slight attention paid to Origen's carefully worked out principles of heuristics and methodics in his *Contra Celsum*. It is precisely in these criteria that we discover Origen's principle for the divination of the sacred.

We would commend the reading of this study particularly to the parish priest; for the problems of the miraculous in Christianity are essentially the same today that they were when Origen answered Celsum and Augustine endeavored to speak to and for the Christian community. To understand the Christian position requires first of all that it be understood within that context of knowledge, thought, doubt, and faith from which it emerged.

OLD TESTAMENT STUDIES TODAY

By WALTER C. KLEIN

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

The Old Testament and Modern Study: A Generation of Discovery and Research. Essays by members of the Society for Old Testament Study. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Oxford Univ. Press, pp. xxxi + 405. \$6.00.

A reviewer faced with a book like *The Old Testament and Modern Study* inevitably feels his limitations and despairs of doing justice to so broad a range of erudition. In this instance only a few comments will be made on each of the thirteen essays that make up this distinguished volume; an appraisal of the work as a whole will follow.

The book opens with an editorial introduction on "Trends in Old Testament Study." In the achievements of Old Testament science during the past twenty-five years the editor finds "progress rather than revolution." Nevertheless, arresting changes have taken place. Critical questions that to the scholars of the first quarter of the century seemed forever settled have been reopened; a new belief in the soundness of the Massoretic text has curbed the practice of rash emendation; and there has been a renaissance of Old Testament theology, which, at a time that all but the youngest of us can clearly remember, was widely regarded as a defunct discipline. If we confine history within very strait bounds, we may grant that "no new trends can be discerned in the treatment of Israelite history," for this generalization must be understood in the light of Rowley's proved familiarity with the work that has actually been done in the historical portion of the Old Testament field; but undeniably our ever-growing knowledge of the ancient Middle East has imparted fresh inspiration, motivation, and direction to the Old Testament historian's specialty and rescued it from its earlier isolation. Old Testament history has, in fact, undergone a radical reorientation, and this change has been immeasurably more stimulating than any mere trend could have been. Rowley takes a balanced view of the new material that archaeology has brought to our notice and reminds us that the last three decades have witnessed a profitable re-examination of the material on which previous generations had worked. For the rest, he

discusses, with the moderation and insight that characterize his writings, the main centers of interest in recent scholarship. Each of the questions he passes in quick review is considered at length in one or more of the essays. Particularly noteworthy are his remarks about the conservative drift now plainly to be seen in various quarters, the specialist's perception of "a greater measure of unity in the Old Testament than was formerly found," and an increasing apprehension of the "fundamentally religious" character of the Old Testament.

Dr. Albright's first essay (he contributes two) is a statement of his present views concerning the archaeology of Palestine. The careful work of the last thirty years, he declares, has, in the main, solved the problem of chronology. We have room for only a few of his dates: Abram (20th or 19th Cent. B.C.), Exodus (c. 1280 B.C.), Song of Deborah (c. 1140—c. 1125 B.C.), burning of Shiloh (c. 1050 B.C.), United Monarchy (c. 1020—c. 922 B.C.), Dead Sea Scrolls (2nd Cent.-1st Cent. B.C.). Of the many opinions expressed in the essay this will no doubt strike the ordinary reader as the most significant: "We may rest assured that the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible, though not infallible, has been preserved with an accuracy perhaps unparalleled in any other Near-Eastern literature."

In his second essay Dr. Albright applies his phenomenal learning to the task of evaluating, with extreme economy of words, the archaeological developments that have helped to bring back to life the world of the Old Testament. Despite the limited space at his command, he succeeds in showing how much Byblus, Ugarit, Mari, Nuzu, and less renowned sites have added to our knowledge of the cultural and historical complex out of which the Old Testament grew. Not only have we a vast new treasury of linguistic material, but also in the fields of law, custom, daily living, religion, and mythology we have acquired information that Old Testament science has only begun to assimilate. As a guide in the now vast domain of Near Eastern archaeology Dr. Albright has no superior.

In executing the formidable task allotted to him, Professor North, who writes on Pentateuchal criticism, records an involved process that is in part an elaboration, and in part an abandonment, either partial or total, of the documentary hypothesis. It is curious that in this acute and comprehensive examination of the principles formulated and the theories advanced during the last thirty years the work of

Winnett¹ and Buber² is ignored. Many investigators have operated within the limits of the old documentary hypothesis or at least used it as a point of departure. Hölscher and Kennett have given Deuteronomy a late date: Welch and Robertson have proposed dates long before the time of Josiah. The designations J¹, J², and P^A, and P^B bear witness to the industrious analysis of the principal documents. Scholars have announced the discovery of new documents: L (Eissfeldt), S (Pfeiffer), and K (Morgenstern). Prof. North's estimate of the last-mentioned type of research will be endorsed by many of the reviewer's former pupils: "It seems likely that with sufficient analytical ingenuity it would be possible to sort out more such documents—this is not to say that there may not have been such documents—especially if we suppose that they were subsequently cut down by redactors." Still another modification of the documentary hypothesis is suggested by Volz, who declines to recognize the Elohist and "P" as distinct narrators. The most resolute attempt to demolish the documentary hypothesis has been made by the Uppsala School, and the reader will welcome Prof. North's summary and criticism of its tenets. For Engnell, the most prominent member of this group of scholars, oral tradition is an exceedingly potent literary force. Engnell's application of his "traditio-historical" principles to the Old Testament leads him to the recognition of two independent literary entities, a P-work (Genesis-Numbers) and a D-work (Deuteronomy-II Kings), both completed in the era of Ezra and Nehemiah. His use of the symbols P and D is, of course, merely a concession to their wide currency. Prof. North concludes with an inquiry into the prospects of Old Testament history and the history of Old Testament religion in the light of present Pentateuchal criticism. The outlook is a trifle depressing. For Pentateuchal criticism itself the future is scarcely more inviting. Pentateuchal critics, despite the fancy terms they employ, have really brought no marvels to light during the last thirty years. They have offered us, in effect, nothing but variations and combinations of the three distinct possibilities of solution that are open to those who wrestle with the problems of the Pentateuch: the fragment-hypothesis, the supplement-hypothesis, and the documentary hypothesis. If the criticism of the last three decades has accomplished anything at all, its achievement lies in the fact that it has proved the

¹F. V. Winnett, *The Mosaic Tradition*, Toronto, 1949.

²M. Buber, *Moses*, Oxford and London, 1946.

inadequacy of all simple, exclusive answers to the fundamental questions.

The next essayist is Prof. Snaith, who writes on the historical books. Dealing, in separate sections and as amply as space permits, with Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, Esther, and Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, he summarizes the findings of several decades of criticism. The chief result of the toil lavished on Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the portion of I Kings that describes the end of David's reign is a negative one: J and E have not been traced in a way that commands wide acceptance, and in any case there are stretches of narrative for which a two-document hypothesis does not suffice. The presence of D in Joshua is acknowledged, and it is generally granted that P also appears. A few writers extend P, as well as the earlier documents, into Kings. About D's editorial activity down to the end of II Kings there is no serious doubt. This comprehensive D edition of Genesis-Kings was preceded by a D edition that appeared before the exile, possibly in the last years of Josiah's reign. Samuel and, in a much greater degree, Kings are largely based on documents that have no obvious connection with the Pentateuchal narratives. Scholarship now favors a post-exilic date for Ruth, but there is no unanimity regarding the aim of this little work. The date and the origin of Esther remain matters of debate. The prevailing view with regard to Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah is that they are parts of a single history written c. 350-250 B.C. Prof. Snaith's lucid treatment of an intricate subject deserves warm commendation. In the hands of a less accomplished writer the immense mass of material here so skilfully handled would have become tedious and bewildering.

The developments that have taken place of late in the study of Hebrew prophecy have cast a spell upon certain minds, and in view of this state of things the selection of a scholar to write the chapter on the prophetic literature cannot have been an altogether easy matter. Unquestionably Dr. Eissfeldt was the man for the job. With level-headed discernment he has pointed out both the potentialities and the limitations of the new interpretation of prophecy. Three aspects of canonical prophecy demand consideration: the cultic character of the prophets, the cultic transmission of their writings, and the true meaning of ecstasy in the entire context of the prophetic vocation. To each of these lines of inquiry a section is devoted and we are then shown how the new criticism has dealt with Isaiah 40-55,

Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joel, Nahum, and Habakkuk. The close association of some prophets with the cult does not mean that all prophets are mere cultic functionaries. Thanks to traditio-historical method, we have learned a great deal about the growth of the prophetic books, but "the view that right down into post-exilic times only oral transmission need seriously be considered is certainly to be rejected, as also that our prophetic books were only then written down, after the hitherto exclusively oral tradition had petrified." Finally, the prophets' capacity for extraordinary spiritual experiences, which remains a matter of dispute, has little to do with the word they were commissioned to speak.

"The Psalms," Prof. A. R. Johnson's essay, is a searching but sympathetic criticism of Gunkel's *Gattungen* and *Formgeschichte*, Mowinkel's cultic theory, and the studies published by scholars who have played less conspicuous roles in the criticism of the Psalter. From Gunkel proceeds the most vital and fruitful impulse in this portion of the Old Testament field. Nevertheless, Gunkel has not spoken the final word, and in our efforts to understand the Psalms in their still obscure cultural setting we shall find occupation for some time to come.

Dr. Baumgartner's essay on the wisdom literature contains the following summary judgment: "During the last generation no revolutionary innovations have appeared in the field of wisdom literature. On the whole, what we find is the systematic development of the new material and views that came to light in the first twenty years of this century. . . . A really important point is that, in contrast to the earlier position, we have learnt to see the development of this whole literature as a type very much more plainly and distinctly." The author discusses Canticles separately, since it is not really a wisdom book. The relatively new "divine marriage" theory does not attract him.

Textual criticism, the subject of Dr. Thomas' essay, is a well-written account of monumental effort and substantial success in a discipline that can entertain no realistic hope of reaching its theoretical goal. Perhaps that goal is an illusion: there have admittedly been standard texts of the Old Testament, but can an "original" text of this body of literature as a whole ever have existed? Be that as it may, Dr. Thomas accurately reports the labors performed and the insight gained. Textual criticism has perfected its tools, improved its tech-

nique, looked beyond its own formal limits for scientific aid, and become conscious of the magnitude of the undertaking to which it is committed. Unlike Dr. Albright, Dr. Thomas maintains an attitude of suspended judgment towards the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Since the First World War our knowledge of the Northwest Semitic languages has increased with extreme rapidity. The details of this sudden and phenomenal growth are set forth in "Semitic Epigraphy and Hebrew Philology," a paper by Prof. Honeyman. Our more intimate acquaintance with the linguistic environment of Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic should enable us to put these tongues to a more precise critical use. A periodical review of the entire field by an expert like Prof. Honeyman is of inestimable service to the ordinary worker.

It is an interesting, if at the same time a somewhat melancholy, exercise to contemplate with Prof. Anderson, who has written the essay called "Hebrew Religion," the ruin of the old evolutionary conception of Israel's religious development and then to follow him into the tangle of present thought on the subject. Specific inquiries have led to striking, and in some cases seemingly valid, conclusions, but it has thus far proved impossible to unify the results of these scattered efforts. Monotheism, the monarchy, collectivism, individualism, myth, eschatology, ritual, the peculiarities of Hebrew thought, the element in Hebrew religion that made it different from other religions—how are these things related and what sort of totality do constitute? Prof. Anderson is obliged to give the only answer that can be regarded as reasonable and truthful at the moment: "Hebrew religion cannot be described in terms of a smooth, orderly, historical development. The symmetrical patterns into which we try to fit it are shattered time and again by historical crises, changes of cultural environment, and the work of great, creative personalities; and when, as we are bound to do, we have done our utmost to find in it factors which are distinctive and constant, it is of the nature of the religion that we are driven back to the actuality of history; for the Old Testament does not contain a speculative religion, but bears witness to the acts of the living God."

We cannot be content with splendid frustration, and therefore we pass on to the penultimate essay, "Old Testament Theology." We feel that here, if anywhere, the essential, binding reality of the Old Testament faith should be reduced to something like a formula. It

is not Prof. Porteous' fault that this expectation is not realized. His primary task is to acquaint us with what has happened, not to supply what is lacking. Prof. Porteous pays a long-overdue tribute to "Davidson's very great book," *The Theology of the Old Testament*, which some of the theologians now active in this department of Old Testament study seem not to have assimilated. The pioneering work of König and Steuernagel receives brief mention, and the essayist then proceeds to dwell at length on Eissfeldt's notion of Old Testament theology. Eissfeldt's attempt to resolve the conflict between knowledge and faith by making each of them wholly independent of the other is appealingly simple, but ultimately inadequate, for, as Prof. Porteous observes, "Eissfeldt does not seem to realize that he can only save the autonomy of *Religionsgeschichte* at the expense of a failure to appreciate the claim of the Old Testament itself that it was precisely in historical events that God did reveal Himself." Eichrodt meets this difficulty by refusing to recognize any absolute bounds. The Old Testament historian and the Old Testament theologian coalesce, but the distinction between biblical theology and dogmatic theology, which dates back to Gabler, is maintained. The Old Testament theologian is not restricted to "genetic analysis." The history of Old Testament religion ought to aim at "making a cross-section through the historical process, thus laying bare the inner structure of the religion and the relationship of its various contents to each other." Yet "value judgments" are not "a normal part of Old Testament theology." Eichrodt defends the right of Old Testament theology to be regarded as a science. At the same time, he is aware that historical writing is selective—or, to put it more strongly, creative—and to that extent subjective. The results to which this and other conceptions of Old Testament theology have led may be observed in the literature of the last two decades. Prof. Porteous introduces us to the thought of Sellin, Köhler, Procksch, H. Wheeler Robinson, Vischer, and Dodd. One certainty emerges from this careful sketch of travel along new roads: the formula that sums up Old Testament religion has not been found. Has the dogmatist any solid reason for hoping that the search will ever end in discovery? If the truths of the Old Testament are alive and operative today, it matters little that we cannot state them in the precise language of a formal creed.

They are, in fact, stated, not only with a greater measure of pre-

cision than most specialists could achieve, but also with transparent conviction and with direct application to present difficulties, by Emeritus Professor T. H. Robinson, who closes the volume with an essay on the lasting verities and the perennial values of the Old Testament. Prof. Robinson runs rapidly over the history of the nation that was schooled beyond other nations in the ways of God, but at the last suffered deeply because it had forgotten or misapplied the truths committed to it. Purged and perfected by Christ, that nation's heritage has passed to us, and upon our heedless heads the neglect of God may yet bring a calamity incalculably greater than the loss of land and temple.

Virtually the only adverse criticism one can make of a book like the one here reviewed is that it is not perfect. In the present instance, the imperfections are almost all negative. Perhaps it is unreasonable to point out this fault, which all broadly-conceived works exhibit in some degree. If the names of a few deserving scholars have been omitted and scarcely any attention has been directed towards Eastern Orthodox, Roman Catholic, or Jewish scholarship, it must be recognized that some measure of selection was necessary. The Society for Old Testament Study has produced a veritable panorama of the Old Testament field.

Explorations in Eastern Palestine, IV. The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vols. XXV-XXVIII, for 1945-1949. By Nelson Glueck. Part I: Text. Part II: Pottery Notes and Plates. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research. Pp. XIX + 711. \$12.00.

In the two volumes under consideration President Glueck presents the fourth and final part of his remarkable archaeological survey of the country formerly known as Transjordan. The physical magnitude and the scientific importance of his investigation have long been recognized. Having dealt in earlier volumes of *The Annual* with the territory south of Wadi Zerqa (Amman to Anazeh in Vol. XIV, pp. 1-113; Edom (Wadi El-Hesa to the Gulf of Aqabah) and some sites in Southern Palestine and Sinai in Vol. XV; and Wadi Zerqa to the Gulf of Aqabah, with some sites north of Wadi Zerqa in Vols. XVIII-XIX), he now closes his account of a huge undertaking with an extraordinarily competent and illuminating description of the archaeological sites of the Jordan Valley and the region lying between the Jabbok (modern Wadi Zerqa) and the Yarmuk.

Dr. Glueck has, of course, not been able to conduct excavations at

all the sites mentioned in his comprehensive study. He has been obliged to rely principally on "surface exploration," to use his term, and in the judgment of some of his critics literally superficial evidence forms an insecure foundation for a reconstruction of the ancient history of Transjordan. Recently Professor W. F. Albright, a pioneer in the development of the technique of surface exploration, has reaffirmed his faith in this means of estimating the age and outlining the history of an ancient settlement: "Having carried out many similar surface explorations himself, and being familiar with the details of Glueck's work, the writer can state with absolute confidence that the latter's conclusions are sound, though this or that detail will doubtless have to be modified" (*The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. H. H. Rowley, Oxford, 1951, p. 4). Few persons are in a position to challenge a scholar of Dr. Glueck's impressive qualifications, and his views will retain their influence until some other archaeologist equals his achievement and, following his route step by step, proves him wrong. This is so improbable that Dr. Glueck can afford to discount the danger.

The evidence, as Dr. Glueck interprets it, indicates—if for the moment we may disregard certain local peculiarities—that Transjordan as a whole, after prospering in the Early Bronze Age, was so weakened by a grievous cultural blow, perhaps a Hyksos invasion, about 1900 that it did not again become the home of a civilization until the Iron Age (*The Other Side of the Jordan*, New Haven, 1940, pp. 114ff., 124). North Gilead and the Jordan Valley, the two regions on which Dr. Glueck concentrates in the present work, show relatively few civilized habitations in Early Bronze IV, but bear marks of stable occupation in Middle Bronze I and, later, of a severe curtailment of civilized life "mainly between the middle of the 18th and the 15th centuries B.C." For the rest of the author's ably-reasoned findings the reader is referred to the Summary at the end of Part I.

The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings: A Reconstruction of the Chronology of the Kingdoms of Israel and Judah. By Edwin R. Thiele. Univ. of Chicago Press. Pp. xxi + 298. \$6.00.

The reviewer has never found leisure for an original and exhaustive study of Old Testament chronology. As a matter of plain fact, therefore, he is not qualified to judge Dr. Thiele's book, and the only thing that gives him the courage to express an opinion is the knowledge that few scholars possess anything like Dr. Thiele's mastery of

the subject. The reviewer ventures to predict that the merits of Dr. Thiele's treatise will be quickly and widely acknowledged. The reason for this favorable judgment is that Dr. Thiele, refusing to take refuge in the assumption that the Books of Kings are full of mistakes, accepts and explains the evidence as it stands. Naturally, the trustworthiness of the Massoretic text is the chief point at issue, but no aspect of the question, which is an extraordinarily involved one, has been neglected.

An introductory chapter outlines the problem and indicates the short-cuts that scholars have taken in their efforts to solve it. The author next enumerates the elements of an adequate chronology. No chronology is sound unless it rests on certainty with regard to the starting-point of the reckoning of a king's reign, and here we need to know not only the year that was regarded as the first of the reign, but also the point in the calendar year that marked the beginning of the first regnal year. When these matters are clear we must look into the practice that prevailed in a given country with respect to chronological statements about the kings of another country. If the two countries had different chronologies, which system was followed in cases of this sort? After this we must settle the question of coregencies and interregna and ascertain how consistently and how long each custom of dating was used. Last of all, we must adjust our chronology, if necessary, to absolute dates.

In computing the length of a king's reign some ancient chronologists excluded, and others included, the year in the course of which he assumed authority. Hence we may distinguish between the "accession-year system" ("postdating") and the "non-accession-year system" ("antedating"), and obviously, as Dr. Thiele puts it, "any particular year of a king's reign according to the non-accession-year system is always one year higher than according to the accession-year system." In one type of calendar the year ran from autumn to autumn: in another, from spring to spring. So far as regnal years are concerned, Judah followed a calendar of the former type, and Israel one of the latter. Less uniform was the practice of the divided kingdoms in the matter of the recognition or non-recognition of a distinct accession year. Israel began with the non-accession-year system and, in the time of King Jehoash, abandoned it for the accession-year system, to which it adhered thereafter. Judah made two changes in the course of its history, commencing with the accession-year system,

adopting the non-accession-year system for Jehoram, Ahaziah, Athaliah, and Joash, and finally reverting to the accession-year system.

The rule governing the synchronisms was essentially simple: "When dealing with Judah and giving the length of reign of the Judean king and the cross reference of his accession with the year of the king then reigning in Israel, both items were given in terms of the type of chronological system then in use in Judah."

Dr. Thiele can discover no proof that an interregnum ever occurred in the history of either kingdom. Two out of the seven coregencies Dr. Thiele recognizes were not added to the years during which the coregents subsequently ruled alone. Therefore in each of five instances a king's reign embraces two periods: the time of his co-rule with his predecessor and the time when he ruled in his own right. In addition, two "rival reigns" caused overlapping.

Our absolute dates come from the Assyrian eponym lists, the Khorsabad King List, Ptolemy's canon, and astronomical observations and calculations.

At one point a faulty synchronism dislocates the chronology. The misstatements of II Kings 17:1 and 18:1, 9, and 10 are the result of the blunder of a late chronologist "who failed to understand just how Pekah had computed his reign and who under the impression that the twenty years recorded for him began with the death of Pekahiah in 740/39, reckoned the death of Pekah as having taken place in 720/19. What he failed to understand was that Pekah had an actual reign in his own right of only eight years, from 740/39 . . . to . . . 732/31. Failing to perceive this, however, he secured the date 720/19 for Hoshea's accession, some twelve years after the correct date. The year 720/19 was known to be the twelfth year of Ahaz, and thus Hoshea's accession was synchronized with Ahaz's twelfth year and was recorded as we now find it in II Kings 17:1."

Dr. Thiele's investigation does not end when he has accounted for the figures in the Massoretic text. The reader who follows his discussion of the Septuagint, Josephus, and modern chronologies will encounter many an illuminating observation. Dr. Thiele has written a book that will carry his name far.

BOOK REVIEWS

An Introduction to the New Testament. By Richard Heard. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950, pp. 268. \$3.00.

Heard's Introduction is a first class textbook and fills a real need for a concise yet adequate treatment of New Testament literature without going into the multiplicity of critical hypotheses with their inevitably bewildering effects on beginners which the heavier books, such as Enslin's *Christian Beginnings*, have. The form of the book makes it easy for the student to use it not only for reading, but also for reference and review purposes. There are numerous sectional and paragraph headings, tabular listings such as of the component parts of the original Passion narrative, the contents of Q, Proto-Luke, the stages and datings of Jesus' life, the chronological arrangement of the Pauline epistles. Bibliographical lists are frequent both for the main sections as well as for individual chapters; and there is an excellent index of biblical references.

A brief introduction opens up the concepts of New Testament criticism and the central historical problem. Then five parts indicate the division of the New Testament materials: the New Testament as a whole (i.e. as a book: history of criticism, the text and canon); the Gospels and the Life of Jesus (principles of study, the oral tradition, Form-Criticism, the Synoptic documents, the Gospel of John, and a brief outline of the life of Jesus); the Acts of the Apostles and the Growth of the Church; the Epistles and the Teaching of the Church; the Revelation of Jesus and Christian Apocalyptic. Throughout, a very substantial positive aspect of the book is its treatment of the teaching value of the documents.

A textbook cannot be written without viewpoints which find dissent among the experts. While on the whole the author's positions are those generally accepted, for example Streeter's source analyses, C. H. Dodd's view of the preaching origins of the Gospel tradition, the length of Jesus' ministry as from 15 to 18 months, the unhistorical value and purpose of the Johannine Gospel in contrast with the Synoptics, and in the area of the Acts and Epistles the views of Foakes-Jackson, E. F. Scott, James Moffatt, A. D. Nock, and others, yet there are positions which will be questioned on one side or the other.

For example, the crucifixion is dated as on the 14th of Nisan, Friday, in accordance with the author's interpretation of John; the epistles of James and Peter are placed early, ca. A.D. 45 and in the early 60's respectively; the author of the Gospel of John is not the Apostle John; the Epistle to the Galatians is dated before the Jerusalem council, early 49 (a dating this reviewer holds as the real solution of the problem involved because it respects the accounts both of Acts and Galatians); Ephesians is under Paul's influence but dates from the early second century and comes from Asia Minor; Hebrews may be placed anywhere between 66 and 80 A.D. For all of the views set forth, pros and cons are given, so that the student can know clearly what evidence exists for any conclusion, and can reasonably differ from the author if he wishes.

The American user of this text will find it necessary to supplement the bibliographies considerably, because they are largely confined to British works. Two defects appear in the book. The placing of the chapters on the Gospel tradition takes that subject out of the natural context of the Apostolic preaching as it emerges out of Acts and the early epistles, and does not give sufficient recognition to the factor of Paul's preaching in the formation of that tradition. The other is its omission of introductory chapters on the Jewish and Hellenistic environment of the New Testament. If it be felt that this is not necessary in an introduction to the literature of the New Testament, it must be pointed out that this book does contain much material about the life of Jesus and the early church and not only about their literature, and that at least the literary relationships of the New Testament writings with the non-Christian literary environment should have been sketched as essential information.

Without doubt, Heard's text will receive—as it deserves—wide and appreciative use not only in England but also in America.

FREDERICK A. SCHILLING

Primitive Gospel Sources. By B. P. W. Stather Hunt. Philosophical Library, pp. xv +344. \$6.00.

This book is a valuable contribution to the study of the literature which preceded the gospels. The author holds that the traditional approach to the synoptic problem which leads to the immediate predecessor "Q" only pushes the real problem one stage further back. Thus he attempts to work forward instead of backward, starting with

the type of literature which was familiar to our Lord and his apostles.

The earliest efforts of primitive Christianity were directed to the persuasion of the Jews. The Book of Acts shows that this was done by a proclamation which gave proof that Jesus was the Messiah because he fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies. The literature that was produced when this argument was put into writing consisted of a collection of the prophecies which were most commonly used, together with their application to those events in our Lord's life which were considered to be their fulfillment. This view is similar to that presented by Rendel Harris.

Hunt maintains that at the time of Jesus a Jewish collection of testimonies existed concerning the Messiah. This was seized upon by the early Church as the necessary proof that Jesus was the long-expected Messiah. Close examination reveals that there is little in the Gospels that cannot be related to the Old Testament in some way. The author feels confident that the earliest official document of the Christian Church was in the nature of a Testimony Book. This was a primitive document with no chronological order which related certain specific events in the life of Jesus to the prophecies which they were seen to have fulfilled. As the mission to the Gentiles developed, this literature was absorbed into the Gospels. The character of this Testimony Book was legal and apocalyptic as well as Messianic. In its legal aspect it collected Old Testament passages concerning the Law and interpreted them wherever possible in the words of Jesus. If we could trace the sources of the two accounts of the Sermon on the Mount back to the point when they first appeared in writing, he maintains that we would find that they belonged to the testimony cycle. These sayings were originally recorded for the purpose of demonstrating the attitude of our Lord to the Law and its ceremonies, and his justification of that attitude from the Old Testament itself. But to the evangelists their value consisted in the fact that they recorded incidents in his life. Hunt suggests that it seems as though "Q" might be a selection of such incidents from this original source. If so, its nature and purpose would be somewhat different from that usually attributed to "Q". Testimony literature contained sayings of our Lord, but these were not collected for their own sake. The primary purpose was to collect Old Testament passages concerning the Law, and to interpret them wherever possible

in the words of our Lord himself; whereas "Q" is generally supposed to be a collection of the sayings of our Lord as such.

The author accepts the fundamental principle of Form Criticism and he believes that his findings are an illustration of it. However, the form critic thinks that it was the situation in the Christian community that produced or preserved these particular stories, while Hunt believes that the stories in the Gospels were selected to illustrate the basic belief upon which the 'community' was founded.

The major portion of the book is given over to the evidences which substantiate this theory. He finds strong support in the New Testament epistles (Rom. 3:10-18, 10:13-21; Gal. 3:6-16). Paul, like the Gospel writers, did not look up his texts in the Old Testament but had available an anthology of prophecies. Similar evidence is drawn from an examination of such sources as the early Fathers, Papias, Barnabas, Melito, Justin, Irenaeus, Eusebius, and the Dialogues.

While it may be that the author, in his own words, has "tried to prove too much," this is certainly a thought-provoking and stimulating contribution to the study of primitive gospel sources. The book is very readable and much of the technical material is given in the footnotes. The print is good and each chapter is prefaced by a synopsis. It contains many valuable notes and tables and is well indexed. The author is the Rector of Pakefield, Lowestoft, and Hon. Canon of Norwich Cathedral.

HARLAN F. FOSS

The Christian Challenge to Philosophy. By W. H. V. Reade. Macmillan, pp. xiii + 195. \$2.75.

Many will remember the remarkable essay on medieval thought and philosophy contributed by Dr. Reade to the *Cambridge Modern History*. The present volume, published posthumously with a felicitous introduction (about Reade and his work in Oxford) by Cyril Bailey, is equally brilliant, equally learned, and equally fascinating.

The main purpose of this book is first to show the "independence" of Christianity from philosophy, strictly speaking, during its formative days; and second, to demonstrate the relevance of the Christian faith in our own time, against competing world views which are, so to say, philosophically established against it. The eight chapters which open the book take us from the "death" of Greek philosophy through the

Middle Ages. Dr. Reade sketches with precision—and humour, too—the work of the pre-Socratics, Plato, and Aristotle. He indicates the way in which theology was “invented” to add a topping to the whole philosophical structure of Greek thought, but questions whether this really made terms with the dynamic religion of the Greek world itself—a point reminiscent of the discussion in Erwin Rohde’s great but little-read *Psyche*.

Christianity rejected Platonism, he says, because even this philosophical theological structure was inadequate to the actuality of the Christian gospel and its insistence on singularity of event, on the profound significance of the body and of the material world, and the inevitable emphasis on *creation* which Christianity owed to its Hebraic background. The great thinkers of the Middle Ages were themselves caught in the same sort of dilemma; if they interpreted Christianity in terms of the rediscovered Aristotelianism, they would turn it into a philosophy, while if they did not, they would fail to make it intelligible to the best knowledge of their time. In that period, the “antithesis of faith and reason” was “imperfectly conceived”, precisely because the equation of reason with Aristotelian “science” confused the situation. The scholastics were right in saying that “the critical function of reason must operate everywhere,” and their contribution in this respect has been enormous. That does not mean that their point of view must therefore be taken in detail as the correct one.

The final four chapters discuss the nature of science, as at present understood, to Christian faith, with special reference to what Reade calls “the scientific way of life”, set up as a competitor of Christianity and defended by the general philosophical view known as materialism. The further implications of this modern movement, as it refers to politics, is treated, and a closing—and beautiful—chapter is concerned with the ways in which Christian faith, which as a religion is itself “the Christian philosophy”, in Reade’s conception, can be shown to be “the revelation in a mystery” of a God whom science and even philosophy proper cannot reach—at least in the sense in which the Christian religion conceives God; yet, since Christianity expands “through a series of interpretations, each one of which has been a new venture”, it must continue to apply reason to what is apprehended through faith.

This is an excellent book, well worth reading and pondering. Per-

haps its teaching may be summed up in a quotation from page 188: "Reason" . . . is a term full of ambiguities, but in so far as it means rationality—the power of reflecting, universalizing, and taking thought for the morrow in a style impossible for animals gifted only with keen perceptions and appetites—there is no reason for counting it morally impeccable, and indeed no reason why a purely and perfectly rational being should not turn out to be Mephistopheles himself. On the other hand, when Christians, flying to the other extreme, denounce reason as the enemy of faith, take a pride in obscurantism, or fall into a foolish panic because some new philosophy or some great scientific discovery is advertised, they are in effect denying the doctrines of Creation and Incarnation no less than the pagans."

W. NORMAN PITTINGER

Biblical Authority for Today: A World Council of Churches Symposium on "The Biblical Authority for the Churches' Social and Political Message for Today."
Ed. by Alan Richardson and W. Schweitzer. Westminster Press, pp. 338. \$4.00.

Following the Amsterdam Assembly of 1948, the World Council of Churches requested its Study Department to launch an ecumenical enquiry on the subject indicated by the title. This book is the result. There are four sections: The Authority of the Bible, Fundamental Considerations; Biblical Theology and Ethics Today, A Survey of the World Position; Principles of Interpretation; Some Specific Applications. Except for Part Two, which was done entirely by Dr. Schweitzer, the sections are divided into sub-sections, each of which is the work of an American or European scholar, representing most of the main Christian traditions outside the Roman Catholic.

Part One purports to be divided on a denominational basis, Orthodox, Methodist, etc., but, with the exception of the Orthodox and Anglican, little or no mention is made of the traditional point of view of the writer's particular church affiliation. For example, the "Baptist Contribution" by the Dean of Theology of Serampore College is devoted mainly to a contrast of the Hindu and Christian points of view in the matter of scriptural authority. As one might expect, the "Orthodox Contribution" stresses the place of tradition in the interpretation of the Bible, but it is also interesting to note that the question of tradition plays a part in the other contributions. As the preface says (p. 11) it is recognized that "the believing attitude of Christians towards the Bible and its message is always mediated to them by the particular Church or community from which they

have received it." The contributors also differ somewhat in their views on the relation of "Natural Law" to "Revelation". The Orthodox and Anglican writers make a place for Natural Law in the Divine Plan, as does the Methodist, although he prefers to call it "the ethical experience of the race". The Reformed contributor refuses to see that it has value, and the Lutheran holds a somewhat mediating position. In general, however, the writers all agree that the Bible does contain "God's Word to Man" and is therefore authoritative, although neither in the Old nor the New Testament is there a system of ethics which can be applied literally to modern society.

Part Two, which in some ways is basic to the whole discussion, points out that the interpretation of the Bible is an ecumenical matter, and that "the work of the historical and critical investigation of the Bible was carried on from its beginnings on an international and interdenominational basis" (p. 129). The earlier period, in which historical and critical problems were the center of attention, has now given place to a concern for theological interpretation. Dr. Schweitzer reviews the stimulating effect on Biblical studies of the "Eschatological School", form criticism, attention to the apostolic *kerygma*, the covenant-idea, and *Heilsgeschichte*. He points to the failure really to grasp the message of the Bible when approached from the point of view of "ecclesiastical authority", "the fundamentalists", or "liberal theology". This leaves only the "dialectical Christocentric solution" in which the 'Word of God' "becomes not identical with the very letter of Scripture; it is rather in a literal sense God's act of speaking with us, his claim upon us, or as the Reformers used to say *viva vox evangelii*" (p. 147). There is danger, of course, in emphasizing too strongly "the existential or matter-of-fact character of the Word of God", but, with proper safe-guards, this approach offers a basis of approach to the problem of social ethics for both the Church and the World.

Part Three is introduced by a short section on "The Relevance of the Bible". This is followed by sections on "Revelation and Interpretation", "History and Interpretation", "The Interpretation of the Bible" (which gives practical hints on the proper methods of study), and the whole is rounded out with a section on "The Bible and the Modern World". A brief quotation will serve to indicate how far

from the liberal, critical position of a previous generation modern Biblical study has moved:

"By means of trinitarian hermeneutics the Old Testament can be found to possess a social and political message which the Church must proclaim to the world. At the same time the Church also must proclaim the new order of salvation, the new age in Christ, toward which the world must inevitably move, because God has so determined by his grace. This new order, grasped by faith, is now actually present in the invisible Church, even though inadequately represented in the visible churches" (p. 239).

Part Four seeks to show how the principles outlined in the previous parts may be applied to such problems of society as Property, Law, Church and State, or Nation and Race.

No review could do justice to the rich variety of material presented in this book. Naturally there is among the several writers a variation in point of view, but there is a surprising unanimity among them as to the fact that the Bible contains the Word of God to man and that, although there is no one system of Biblical ethics which may be applied directly to human society, the Bible does offer certain authoritative presuppositions in the light of which every human institution is to be judged.

E. J. COOK

Sponsors at Baptism and Confirmation. An Historical Introduction to Anglican Practice. By Derrick Sherwin Bailey. Macmillan, pp. xiii + 162. \$2.25.

Dr. Bailey's contribution to the current discussions on Baptism and Confirmation is a minute survey of the responsibilities, qualifications, and regulations concerning Sponsorship from the earliest times through the centuries to the present day. He has not, however, entered into debate over the theological issues of Christian initiation, and his recommendations confine themselves to more practical problems.

In the early centuries, when adult baptism was the norm, sponsors represented the candidate as a guarantee of his sincerity, and possibly assisted in his preparation for initiation. But once the candidate was baptized (and confirmed) the sponsor's responsibility ceased. In the case of infants, parents usually acted as sponsors. After the time of Augustine, when infant baptism became the norm, sponsors came to act as representatives of the Church, and their duties began

at baptism—namely, the Christian nurture of the child. This led in turn to the medieval conception of “spiritual relationship,” whereby sponsors were transformed into godparents; and a complex canonical regulation was developed regarding prohibition of marriage within these relationships. The English Church at the Reformation tacitly dropped the medieval regulations concerning “spiritual relationship,” but otherwise kept the medieval practice. But the end result has been that sponsors have in many instances ceased to have any function other than a liturgical one in the rite of baptism, and their duties have largely reverted to parents, so far as the religious nurture of children is concerned.

In conclusion, Dr. Bailey addresses himself to the question as to whether sponsorship can “be made a more effective and significant institution than it is at present.” He believes that parents should be normally sponsors (a thing always allowed in our American Prayer Book). Sponsors should be communicants; and “no one, other than parents for their own children, should be permitted to act as sponsors more than a very limited number of times; ideally, apart from one’s own children, a single godchild is a sufficient responsibility for any Christian.” Dr. Bailey also suggests an addition to the baptism rite—“a formal dedication and commissioning of sponsors.”

With these suggestions, few would disagree. But what Dr. Bailey has not considered is whether the whole office of sponsorship (other than parents) is not something of an anachronism. Especially in America, where population is so mobile, and distances so great, it is almost impossible for sponsors, with the best of will, to fulfill their proper functions. They often have little personal association with their godchildren, simply because they do not live close enough to them. A realistic view would make parents, and also the parish church, responsible for “sponsorship.” In addition, other sponsors might be allowed where conditions and circumstances seem to promise an effective supervision.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

The Psalms and their Meaning Today.
By Samuel Terrien. Bobbs-Merrill,
pp. 278. \$3.00.

The Old Testament editor of The Interpreter's Bible has written a book on the Psalter which ranks with the very best of modern works. It deals with the original purpose, the contents, religious truth, poetic beauty, and significance of the Psalms. It is a book for the ordinary reader who loves the Psalms and wishes to know them better, for the preacher who takes inspiring texts from this ancient collection of sacred poesy, for the exegete and theologian who wish to use these writings for the purpose of showing the on-going course of divine revelation. When we say the book belongs on the same shelf with Gunkel's *Selected Psalms*, Fleming James's *Thirty Psalmists*, and the more recent books by Oesterley, Leslie, Paterson, and Weiser, the reader knows what to expect—and he will not be disappointed. The ordinary reader will be struck especially by the quotations from world-poetry outside the Psalter, including contemporary poetry as well as classical. It is a most valuable and useful work.

F. C. G.

Harper's Bible Dictionary. Ed. by Madeline and J. Lane Miller. Harper,
pp. xi + 851 + 16 pl. \$7.95.

This is a very useful new Bible Dictionary, taking account of the latest researches in Bible lands (the Westminster maps are here in color), lavishly illustrated (531 pictures), and written clearly and compactly. There are tiny errors which the expert can detect, but the "overall" accuracy of the work is unquestionable.

The Gospels Translated into Modern English. By J. B. Phillips. Macmillan, pp. xi + 243. \$2.75.

Mr. Phillips's translation of the New Testament Epistles, *Letters to Young Churches*, created a sensation a couple of years ago, and he has now done the Gospels in similar style. Many readers, no doubt, will first get the full force of many a passage from this translation which is, nevertheless, more often a paraphrase than a translation. Often the heavy "you must" lends weight to the imperative; the Beatitudes begin "How happy"; "they that mourn" becomes "those who know what sorrow means"; the Hosanna at the Triumphal Entry becomes "God bless Him, Hurrah for the man who comes in the name of the Lord, hurrah for the King of Israel!" The book is a strange *mélange* of brilliant insight, fresh interpretation, deep religious understanding, and—pure journalism! But one can learn from it, even a scholar can learn a great deal from it. But the reader (especially the lay reader) should be warned that it is not really a "translation."

F. C. G.

Bible Key Words. From Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Tr. and ed. by J. R. Coates. Harper, pp. xiv + 330. \$4.00.

When the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, edited by Gerhard Kittel, began to appear in 1933, it gathered together material which had long been scattered, but it added much to that material beyond superior organization. The difficulty besetting its wide distribution outside the Continent was its language; too few students are at

home in German. Sensing this difficulty, the Rev. J. R. Coates, now minister of Wesley Hill Church in Birmingham, England, set out in 1949 to translate some of the key articles. Each of the first four has appeared separately in England, but they were not available in the United States until the present edition was published by Harper. All four are included, with their title pages and original pagination. The four articles are those on Love, the Church, Sin, and Righteousness.

The reader familiar with the German edition will notice that the author has tried less to produce a literal translation of the whole of each article than to get across the main ideas in a flowing and easily read style. Good translations should carry the meaning from one language to another without loss either of that meaning or of the literary style of the original. According to this canon, Dr. Coates' translation is a good one.

J. L. M.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Bd. V, Lfg. 12. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, pp. 705-768. DM 4.60, by subsc. only.

The new installment of the *Wörterbuch* brings the work down to *paradeisos*, and includes such important articles as *pais theou* (continuation), *palai*, *para*, *parabolē*, and *paraggelō*.

The Religion of Jesus. By Leroy Waterman. Harper, pp. 251. \$3.00.

The religion of Jesus was a fresh expression of the ethical religion of the prophets, which was a repudiation of Jewish nationalism whose end products were messianic expectations and apocalyptic dreams. Jesus regarded himself as a prophet (Mark 6:4), not as Messiah. According to Mark 8:29 he did not, as in Matt. 16:17, commend Peter;

and his own reply to the high priest in Matt. 26:64. Luke 22:70 suggests that the affirmation in Mark 14:62 is not authentic. As an exponent of prophetic religion summoning men to repentance, Jesus could not have shared the apocalyptic viewpoint which demanded not reform but only endurance awaiting divine intervention. The kingdom of God—so Luke 17:21 should be understood—is within man's reach. But it is not for his prophetic religion that Jesus was remembered but as Messiah, risen from the dead and soon to return from heaven. Passages which represent him as founding a church, instituting sacraments—fruitful sources of sectarian divisions—were products of early Christianity. The book, one-sided but for that reason intensely provocative, ends with an impassioned plea for a return to the prophetic religion of Jesus, which means a thorough-going reform of all existing churches.

O. J. F. S.

Hellenistic Civilization. By W. W. Tarn assisted by G. T. Griffith. 3d ed. Longmans, pp. xi + 372. \$4.75.

This book was first published in 1927; a second edition, slightly revised, appeared in 1930; since then it has been repeatedly reprinted and has been in fact one of the most indispensable texts in its field. In the new edition it has been revised, footnotes checked and supplemented, fresh material taken into consideration, and the whole book reset. It is to be hoped that the work will have another twenty-five years of useful life and wide recognition. It is no mere work of reference, but a fascinating picture of the whole range of that civilization which laid the foundations for the later Roman Imperial, Byzantine, and Mediaeval cultures, and even for that of modern Europe. Our civilization today, as Paul Wendland said, owes an immense

debt to the leaven of Hellenism which was spread through the Mediterranean and Near Eastern world between the time of Alexander and the Battle of Actium. The final chapter, on Philosophy and Religion, is especially important for the student of New Testament and early Church history. This chapter, in the new edition, has had the benefit of Professor A. D. Nock's searching scrutiny and constructive help. F. C. G.

Macrobius: Commentary on the Dream of Scipio. Tr. with an Int. by William Harris Stahl. Columbia Univ. Press, pp. xiv + 277. \$4.00.

Macrobius was one of those lovers of learning—a "philomath"—who gathered up the fragments that nothing might be lost at the end of antiquity, to whom we owe so much of our knowledge of books that have perished except for the fragments thus preserved. He was a Neoplatonist, and he lived at the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth century. Cicero's philosophical fantasia, the *Dream of Scipio*—itself a fragment of a lost book in his *De Republica*—was a fascinating excursion into the realm of cosmology. It intrigued the learned Macrobius, and he turned Cicero into a model fourth century Neoplatonic philosopher.—These are the factors that make the book so valuable for the study of late classical thought and for the dawning mediaeval period. Dr. Stahl's excellent translation and notes fill an important lacuna and will be welcomed by all students of ancient philosophy and religion, patristics, philology, and science.

F. C. G.

Kerygma und Mythos. Ed. by Hans Werner Bartsch. Hamburg-Volksdorf: Evangelischer Verlag, pp. 219.

New edition of Dr. Bultmann's *Neues Testament und Mythologie* with ten es-

says by various writers discussing the proposal. This is the material for one of the most interesting and important debates in the modern theological field.

A History of the Crusades. By Steven Runciman. Vol. I, *The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, pp. xiii + 377. \$5.00. Vol. II, *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Frankish East*, pp. xii + 491. Cambridge Univ. Press, \$7.50.

This is history as it ought to be written—i.e. to be read with enjoyment. Dr. Runciman is vastly learned, and has done a prodigious task in disentangling the ancient sources (esp. the oriental, which often contain guesses and dim recollections set on a par with annalistic records); but he has mastered the art of writing clearly, interestingly, even fascinatingly. We are so accustomed to dull prosaic compilations of facts, piled up like neat cordwood by our "scientific" historians, that Runciman's work comes as a delightful surprise. His picture of the heroic young Baldwin defending Jerusalem in a hopeless contest with Saladin; of the gracious, chivalrous, noble Saladin himself; of the land-hungry younger sons of the Franks; of the baffled, peace-loving, exasperated Byzantines—these are unforgettable. So is his account of the terrible Battle of Hattin, which ranks with Hilaire Belloc's classic description of it. One more volume is to follow.

F. C. G.

The Beatitudes. By Hugh Martin. Harper, pp. 91. \$1.00.

A brief and simple exposition of the Beatitudes, based on sound scholarship, and valuable for devotional reading as well as for historical or theological. There are good discussion questions at the end.